arXiv:1410.4039v2 [math.AG] 23 Jun 2015

AN EXAMPLE OF A NON-FOURIER-MUKAI FUNCTOR BETWEEN DERIVED CATEGORIES OF COHERENT SHEAVES

ALICE RIZZARDO AND MICHEL VAN DEN BERGH

Abstract. Orlov's famous representability theorem asserts that any fully faithful exact functor between the bounded derived categories of coherent sheaves on smooth projective varieties is a Fourier-Mukai functor. In this paper we show that this result is false without the full faithfulness hypothesis.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Acknowledgements 6
3. Notation and preliminaries 7
4. The main technical construction 8
5. Derived Injectives 19
6. Deformations 23
7. Obstruction theory 26
8. Sheaves and presheaves 31
9. Some properties of divisors 38
10. Construction of potential non-Fourier-Mukai functors 43
11. Proof of Theorem 1.4 45
Appendix A. Construction of L using A_n-functors 49
Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 1.2 53
Appendix C. Proof of Proposition 1.3 53
References 54

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D09, 18E30, 14A22.

Key words and phrases. Fourier-Mukai functor, Orlov's theorem.

The first author is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of Edinburgh. The second author is a senior researcher at the FWO.

This research started at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in 2013 with the support of the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0932078 000. A number of results were obtained during research visits of the first author to the University of Hasselt, supported by ESF Exchange Grant 4498 in the framework of the project "Interactions of Low-Dimensional Topology and Geometry with Mathematical Physics (ITGP)" and by the FWO grant 1503512N "Non-commutative algebraic geometry" and by the second author to the International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA) at Trieste. The authors are very grateful to the NSF, the MSRI, the ESF, the steering committee of the ITGP project, the FWO and SISSA for their financial and moral support.

1. Introduction

Throughout k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. All objects and constructions are assumed to be k-linear.

Recall the following seminal theorem proved by Orlov almost 20 years ago:

Theorem 1.1. [38, Thm 2.2] *Let X/k, Y/k be smooth projective schemes. Then every fully faithful exact functor $\Psi : D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \to D^b(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$ is isomorphic to a Fourier-Mukai functor associated to an object in $D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X \times_k Y))$.*

Although this theorem was generally believed to be false without the hypothesis that Ψ is fully faithful, no counterexamples were known up to now. *In the current paper we fill this gap by constructing such a counterexample.*

The counterexample is presented in Theorem 1.4 below, but we will first discuss the underlying ideas on which it is based. First note that $D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X))$, $D^b(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$ are equipped with canonical DG-enhancements [31] and it is well known that any functor $D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \to D^b(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$ that lifts to a DG-functor is Fourier-Mukai [10, 46]. For the purpose of this introduction let us call a functor between enhanced trianguled categories that lifts to a DG-functor "enhanceable". Thus our mission is to construct a *non*-enhanceable functor $D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \to D^b(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$.

Known examples of non-enhanceable functors are few and far between, but some progress has been made in [44] where the most elementary case - the source triangulated category being the derived category of a field - was analyzed systematically. Leveraging this theory, we were able to construct a non-Fourier-Mukai functor $D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \to D^b(\mathrm{Qch}(Y))$ by factoring through the localization at the generic point of X. Unfortunately, such methods do not allow one to replace $\mathrm{Qch}(Y)$ by $\mathrm{coh}(Y)$.

A highly nontrivial example of a non-enhanceable exact functor is given in the beautiful paper [35]. As Neeman is working in a topological context the definition of enhanceable needs to be suitably adapted but we will not discuss this here.

Let Ho(Sp) be the homotopy category of spectra. In [35], Neeman constructs an exact functor[1]

$$D^b(\mathbb{Z}[1/2]) \to \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Sp})[1/2] \tag{1.1}$$

which sends $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ to $\Sigma^\infty S^0$.

Now note that $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Sp})^{-1}(\Sigma^\infty S^0, \Sigma^\infty S^0) = \pi_1(\Sigma^\infty S^0) = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. So

$$\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Sp})[1/2]^{-1}(\Sigma^\infty S^0, \Sigma^\infty S^0) = 0$$

and Neeman's proof strongly suggests that it is precisely this gap in the negative Ext's that makes this example work.

Our main technical result in this paper, Theorem 4.1.1 below, builds on this idea and yields a generalization of Neeman's result in an algebraic context. Our result, being algebraic in nature, does not imply Neeman's result, although it is conceivable that our methods could be generalized to cover it. For the purpose of this introduction we state a corollary of our main theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *(see Appendix B)*

[1]The actual result proved in loc. cit. is for $D(\mathbb{Z}[1/2])$.

(1) *Let B be a DG-algebra and let $R \to H^0(B)$ be a k-algebra morphism. Assume that* $\operatorname{gl\,dim} R = m$ *and $H^i(B) = 0$ for $i = -1, \ldots, -m$. Then the natural functor*

$$R \to D(B) : R \mapsto B$$

(R considered as a one-object category) extends to an exact functor

$$L : D^b(R) \to D(B). \tag{1.2}$$

(2) *If L is isomorphic to a functor of the form $U \overset{L}{\otimes}_R -$, for U a complex of k-central $B-R$-bimodules, then the graded k-algebra morphism $R \to H^*(B)$ may be lifted to an A_∞-morphism $R \to B$.*

As expected, if R is a field Theorem 1.2(1) imposes no conditions on B and hence this theorem may be regarded as an extension of the basic principle underlying the constructions in [44].

We present two different constructions for the functor L, one using filtered derived categories and one using A_n-functors (see Appendix A). That the latter is possible confirms the folklore principle that (algebraic) non-enhanceable functors should somehow be associated to A_n-functors which are not A_∞. However, to the best of our knowledge, this idea has not been used explicitly before.

In order do be able to apply part (2) of Theorem 1.2 we note that there are very concrete obstructions against the lifting of a morphism of graded rings to an A_∞-morphism (see §7.2 below). In the setting of Theorem 1.2, these obstructions take values in the Hochschild cohomology groups

$$\operatorname{HH}^i(R, H^{2-i}(B)) \tag{1.3}$$

for $i \geq m + 3$. Since such obstructions are easily controlled, Theorem 1.2(1) immediately gives a supply of non-enhanceable functors. The most basic case is the following.

Proposition 1.3. *(see Appendix C.2). Let R be a k-algebra of global dimension m and let M be a k-central R-bimodule. Let $\eta \in \operatorname{HH}^n(R, M)$ be a non-zero class in Hochschild cohomology, with $n \geq m + 3$. Let R_η be the A_∞-algebra $R \oplus \Sigma^{n-2} M\epsilon$, $\epsilon^2 = 0$, whose multiplication is twisted by η (i.e. m_{n,R_η} is given by $\eta : R^{\otimes n} \to M$). Finally, let R_η^{dg} be the DG-hull of R_η (see Appendix C.1 below). Then the functor L in Theorem 1.2(1), with $B = R_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}$ is not isomorphic to a functor of the form $U \overset{L}{\otimes}_R -$ for U a $R_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}-R$-DG-bimodule.*

In this proposition we have introduced R_η^{dg} to stay within the world of DG-algebras but in fact the distinction between R_η and R_η^{dg} is only of technical relevance and we will ignore it in the rest of this introduction.

The functors constructed via Proposition 1.3 may be called "non-Fourier-Mukai" is a generalized sense. Unfortunately they are essentially non-geometric because:

(1) They involve DG-algebras.
(2) If R is commutative and finitely generated over an algebraically closed field, the Hochschild dimension of R is equal to the global dimension. This implies for example that the inequality $n \geq m + 3$ cannot be satisfied if we want $\operatorname{Spec} R$ to be an affine variety. Note however that the equality can

be satisfied with R being *essentially* of finite type (e.g. take $R = M = k(x, y, z)$).

To get rid of the first problem in the ring case, one may consider the situation where there is some k-algebra morphism $f : S \to R$ such that $0 = f_*(\eta) \in \mathrm{HH}^n(S, M)$. In that case one may show that there is a commutative diagram of A_∞-algebras (see Proposition 7.2.6 below)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R_\eta & \overset{\tilde{f}}{\dashleftarrow} & S \\ & \searrow \quad \swarrow_{f} & \\ & R & \end{array} \tag{1.4}$$

Starting from (1.4) one could hope that in some cases the composition

$$\Psi : D^b(R) \xrightarrow{(1.2)} D(R_\eta) \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}_*} D(S) \tag{1.5}$$

is not given by tensoring with a complex of bimodules. We have not really investigated how well this method works for contructing non-Fourier-Mukai functors between derived categories of rings but the underlying idea is used in the geometric case we consider below. By a stroke of luck the geometric construction will also be seen to yield an example of a non-Fourier-Mukai functor between derived categories of finite dimensional algebras. See Corollary 1.5 below.

To deal with the second problem note that, if X is a smooth projective variety of dimension m, then $\operatorname{gl\,dim} \mathrm{Qch}(X) = m$, whereas the Hochschild dimension of X is $2m$ (see e.g. §9.6 below). So in that case there is no problem satisfying the inequality $n \geq m + 3$ when $m \geq 3$.

As a thought experiment we will consider the following situation: X is as in the previous paragraph, $n \geq m + 3$, M is an $\mathcal{O}_X$-module. Let $0 \neq \eta \in \mathrm{HH}^n(X, M) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Ext}^n_{X \times_k X}(i_{\Delta,*}\mathcal{O}_X, i_{\Delta,*}M)$ ($i_\Delta : X \to X \times X$ being the diagonal). Then we expect there to be some kind of derived deformation (or infinitesimal thickening) $X \to X_\eta$ corresponding to η. We will discuss this further below, but for now assume X_η exists. Assume furthermore there is some morphism $f : X \to Y$ with Y smooth such that $f_*(\eta) = 0$. Then, as in the ring case, we expect there to be a diagram of the type

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_\eta & \overset{\tilde{f}}{\dashrightarrow} & Y \\ & \nwarrow \quad \nearrow_{f} & \\ & X & \end{array}$$

which should in principle allow us to define a functor as in (1.5).

Now we have to deal with the question: what is X_η? One canonical answer is to use η to deform an enhancement of $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$ [23, 31, 32]. But then one hits the so-called "curvature" problem: the result will in general only be a cA_∞-category [16, 28], i.e. roughly speaking it will satisfy $d^2 \neq 0$. Homological algebra over cA_∞-categories is possible [16, 39] but presents rather serious technical difficulties.

Another approach is to view X_η as a kind of DG-gerbe on X. However in our examples η will be very non-local, so the "higher gluing" required to understand X_η will be necessarily subtle.

In this paper we have opted for third approach (based on [29]) which is much cheaper but nonetheless sufficient for our purposes. The idea is to embed $\mathrm{Qch}(X)$ into a *category of presheaves* associated to an affine covering of X. Such presheaves form a module category so we can directly apply the algebraic constructions discussed above. In particular there is no curvature problem.

Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} U_i$ be an affine covering. For $I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ put $U_I = \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i$. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the set $\{I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid I \neq \emptyset\}$ and let $\mathcal{X}$ be the category with objects $\mathcal{I}$ and Hom-sets

$$\mathcal{X}(I, J) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_X(U_J) & J \subset I \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

In other words $\mathcal{X}$ is the subcategory of $\mathrm{Qch}(X)$ spanned by the objects $(i_{U_I,*}\mathcal{O}_{U_I}))_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ where we only allow maps $I \to J$ when $J \subset I$. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is finite one may even think of $\mathcal{X}$ as an actual ring $\bigoplus_{I,J \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{X}(I, J)$.

It is easy to see that $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{X})$ is the category of modules over the presheaf of rings $(I, \Gamma(U_I, \mathcal{O}_{U_I}))_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$. In particular $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{X})$ contains $\mathrm{Qch}(X)$ as a full subcategory. Furthermore by the "Special Cohomology Comparison Theorem" [17, 30] one has $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{HH}^*(X, M)$ (see §8.2 below) where $\mathcal{M}$ is the $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{X}$-bimodule associated to M defined by a similar formula as (1.6). It follows that we may define and A_∞-category $\mathcal{X}_\eta$ in exactly the same way as we defined R_η.

Assume now that f, X, Y, η are as above and that in addition $f : X \to Y$ is a closed immersion, and start with an affine covering of Y. By giving X the induced covering, we may then construct a diagram of A_∞-categories and functors



(the arrows are reversed by the usual algebraic geometric duality) and we may construct an exact functor

$$\Psi : D^b(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \xrightarrow{L} D_{\mathrm{Qch}}(\mathcal{X}_\eta) \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}_*} D_{\mathrm{Qch}}(\mathcal{Y}) \cong D(\mathrm{Qch}(Y)), \tag{1.7}$$

where the first functor is a geometric version of (1.2) and where $D_{\mathrm{Qch}}(-)$ means that we only consider complexes with quasi-coherent cohomology, through the embedding $\mathrm{Qch}(X) \subset \mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{X})$. In fact, since $\mathrm{Qch}(X)$ has enough injectives but not projectives, the first functor is given by a construction dual to the one presented in Theorem 1.2(1). See Remark 10.2 below.

Now we may state our main theorem.

Theorem 1.4. *(see §11 below) Let X be a smooth quadric in $Y = \mathbb{P}^4$, and let $f : X \to Y$ be the inclusion. Let $M = \omega_X^{\otimes 2}$ and let $0 \neq \eta \in \mathrm{HH}^6(X, \omega_X^{\otimes 2}) \cong k$. Then $f_*\eta \in \mathrm{HH}^6(Y, f_*(\omega_X^{\otimes 2}))$ is zero. The functor Ψ in (1.7) restricts to an exact functor*

$$\Psi : D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \to D^b(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$$

which is not a Fourier-Mukai functor.

Recall [15, 42] that even for a non-Fourier-Mukai functor one may still define sheaves $\mathcal{H}^i$ on $X \times_k Y$ which would be the cohomology of the kernel - if the latter existed. In our case we have (see (10.6) below)

$$\mathcal{H}^i = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_f} & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \omega_{\Gamma_f}^{\otimes -2} & \text{if } i = 4 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\Gamma_f \subset X \times_k Y$ is the graph of f.

To conclude this introduction, let us indicate how we prove that Ψ in Theorem 1.4 is not Fourier-Mukai (see §11 below). The technical details are somewhat involved but the underlying idea is the following. It is well known that X has a tilting bundle T. Let $\Gamma = \mathrm{End}_X(T)$. Then by functoriality $\Psi(T)$ is an object in $D(\mathrm{coh}(Y))_\Gamma$ (that is: the category of objects in $D(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$ equipped with a Γ-action). However T may also be viewed as an object in $D(\mathrm{coh}(X)_\Gamma)$ and if Ψ were a Fourier-Mukai functor then $\Psi(T)$ would be an object in $D(\mathrm{coh}(Y)_\Gamma)$. It turns out there is a non-vanishing homological obstruction against lifting $\Psi(T)$ under the obvious functor $D(\mathrm{coh}(Y)_\Gamma) \to D(\mathrm{coh}(Y))_\Gamma$ finishing the proof.

Valery Lunts suggested adding the following immediate corollary of Theorem 1.4 for finite dimensional algebras. Recall that Rickard proved in [41, Theorem 3.3] that if Γ and Λ are derived equivalent k-algebras, then there is an equivalence of the form

$$U \overset{L}{\otimes}_\Gamma - : D^b(\Gamma) \to D^b(\Lambda)$$

where U is a complex of $\Lambda - \Gamma$ bimodules. However, in contrast with the geometric situation (see Theorem 1.1), it is unknown whether all derived equivalences between rings are of this form. The next corollary states that there do indeed exist exact functors between derived categories of finite dimensional algebras that are not given by tensoring with a bimodule. They are however not derived equivalences.

Corollary 1.5. *With the notation of Theorem 1.4, let* $\Gamma = \mathrm{End}_X(T)$, $\Lambda = \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{P}^4}\left(\oplus_{i=0}^4 \mathcal{O}(i)\right)$. *Then the functor* Ψ *induces a functor*

$$\Phi : D^b(\Gamma) \to D^b(\Lambda)$$

which is not of the form $U \overset{L}{\otimes}_\Gamma -$ *for* U *a complex of* $\Lambda - \Gamma$*-bimodules.*

A number of extensions and variants of Orlov's theorem are known. See e.g. [3, 11, 12, 13, 15, 21, 31, 42, 43]. For an excellent survey on the current state of knowledge see [14].

2. Acknowledgements

The authors thank Greg Stevenson and Adam-Christiaan Van Roosmalen for a number of interesting discussions which reinforced our interest in the problem.

The first author would like to thank the University of Hasselt for its hospitality during two recent visits to Belgium. She would also like to thank MSRI for providing a welcoming environment during the Noncommutative Geometry and Representation Theory semester, which encouraged many fruitful conversations,

some of which got this project started. Finally, she would like to thank her advisor, Johan de Jong, for originally suggesting she look into exact functors between derived categories in the non fully faithful case.

The second author thanks the International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA) in the beautiful city of Trieste for the wonderful working conditions it provides.

The authors thank Andrei Căldăraru for useful discussions concerning derived self intersections and Fourier-Mukai functors. They are deeply grateful to Wendy Lowen for allowing the use of some ideas developed during an ongoing cooperation with the second author.

3. Notation and preliminaries

Throughout k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero and all constructions will be k-linear.

3.1. **Modules and bimodules over categories.** Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a pre-additive category. A left $\mathfrak{a}$-module M is a covariant additive functor $M : \mathfrak{a} \to \mathbf{Ab}$. We view it as a collection of abelian groups $M(A)_{A\in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathfrak{a})}$ depending covariantly on A. We write $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathfrak{a})$ for the additive category of left $\mathfrak{a}$-modules.

A right $\mathfrak{a}$-module is an object in $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathfrak{a}^\circ)$. If $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$ are k-linear categories, a (k-linear) $\mathfrak{a}$-$\mathfrak{b}$-bimodule is an object in $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathfrak{a} \otimes_k \mathfrak{b}^\circ)$. We view it as a collection of k-vector spaces $M(B, A)_{B\in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathfrak{b}),A\in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathfrak{a})}$ depending contravariantly on B and covariantly on A. We will sometimes write $\mathrm{Bimod}_k(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ for $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathfrak{a} \otimes_k \mathfrak{b}^\circ)$. Given $M \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathfrak{b})$ and a functor $\mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{a}$, we will write $\mathfrak{a} \otimes_{\mathfrak{b}} M$ to denote the tensor product of M with the $\mathfrak{a}$-$\mathfrak{a}$ bimodule $\mathfrak{a}(-,-)$ viewed as an $\mathfrak{a}$-$\mathfrak{b}$-bimodule.

If $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$ are DG-categories, the above notions have obvious generalizations to DG-modules, DG-bimodules, etc. We write $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(\mathfrak{a})$ for the category of left DG-$\mathfrak{a}$-modules.

3.2. **Twisted complexes.** If $\mathfrak{a}$ is a DG-category, $\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{a}$ is the DG-category of twisted complexes over $\mathfrak{a}$ [8]. Objects in $\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{a}$ are given by data $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}, (\delta_{ij})_{j\geq i+1}$ where

(1) $A_i \in \mathrm{Free}\,\mathfrak{a}$ where $\mathrm{Free}\,\mathfrak{a}$ is the DG-category consisting of finite (formal) sums $\bigoplus_l \Sigma^{n_l} A_{il}$ where $A_{il} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathfrak{a})$.
(2) At most a finite number of A_i are non-zero.
(3) $\delta_{ij} \in (\mathrm{Free}\,\mathfrak{a})(A_i, A_j)$ with $|\delta_{ij}| = -j + i + 1$.
(4) $d(\delta) + \delta^2 = 0$ where δ is the formal sum $\sum_{ij} \delta_{ij}$.

Morphisms are given by

$$(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{a})((A, \delta), (A', \delta'))^k = \{(f_{ij}) \mid f_{ij} \in (\mathrm{Free}\,\mathfrak{a})(A_i, A_j), |f_{ij}| = -j + i + k\}$$

and the differential is given by $d_{\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{a}}(f) = d_{\mathrm{Free}\,\mathfrak{a}}(f) + [\delta, f]$. Note that although objects in $\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{a}$ are naturally filtered, morphisms are not required to respect this filtration.

By construction $H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{a})$ is a triangulated category. A DG-category $\mathfrak{a}$ is called an enhanced triangulated category if the natural DG-functor $\mathfrak{a} \to \mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{a}$ induces an equivalence of categories $H^0(\mathfrak{a}) \to H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{a})$.

If $\mathfrak{a}$ is embedded in a DG-category $\mathcal{C}$ of the form $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(\mathfrak{b})$ or in a category of complexes $C(\mathcal{A})$ over an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ then we write $\mathrm{Tot}((A_i)_i, (\delta_{ij})_{ij}) = (\oplus_i \Sigma^i A_i, d + \delta) \in \mathcal{C}$.

According to [8, Prop. 2.1] there is an equivalence of DG-categories $\operatorname{Tw}\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{a} \to \operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{a}$ also denoted by Tot. We will often use this equivalence implicitly.

3.3. **A_∞-notions.** If $\mathfrak{a}$ is a DG-graph, we denote by $\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a}$ its bar-cocategory. I.e. $\operatorname{Ob}(\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a}) = \operatorname{Ob}(\mathfrak{a})$ and

$$\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a}(A, B) = \bigoplus_{A_1,\dots,A_{i-1}\in\operatorname{Ob}(\mathfrak{a})} \Sigma\mathfrak{a}(A_{i-1}, B) \otimes \dots \otimes \Sigma\mathfrak{a}(A, A_1)$$

An A_∞-structure on $\mathfrak{a}$ is a codifferential $b_\mathfrak{a}$ on $\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a}$. Similarly, an A_∞-functor between A_∞-categories $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$ is a cofunctor $f : \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a} \to \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b}$ such that $b_\mathfrak{b} \circ f = f \circ b_\mathfrak{a}$.

As usual, we describe A_∞-structures and morphisms via their Taylor coefficients: $(b_{\mathfrak{a},j})_j$, $(f_j)_j$ which may be evaluated on sequences of j composable maps.

All A_∞-constructions will always be implicitly assumed to be strictly unital. Note that any reasonable A_∞-construction can be strictified, which is ultimately due to the fact that Hochschild cohomology may be computed using normalized cocycles. See [24, Ch. 3]. We routinely apply standard constructions for A_∞-algebras to A_∞-categories. This simply means that operations are only applied to composable arrows.

If $\mathfrak{b}$ is a A_∞-category, we will denote by $C^u_\infty(\mathfrak{b})$ the category of (strictly unital) A_∞-$\mathfrak{b}$-modules with A_∞-morphisms. Let $D_\infty(\mathfrak{b})$ be obtained from $C^u_\infty(\mathfrak{b})$ by identifying homotopic maps. This is one of several equivalent constructions for the derived category of an A_∞-category. See [24] for details.

4. The main technical construction

4.1. **Introduction and statement of the main result.** In this section we state our main technical result in a form which is most convenient for its proof. For applications see Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 5.3.1.

Recall that constructions are assumed to be k-linear. We consider the following data:

- an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ with enough injectives of global dimension m;
- a DG-category $\mathfrak{b}$ such that $\mathfrak{b}(B, B')^n = 0$ for $n > 0$ satisfying in addition

$$H^i(\mathfrak{b}) = 0 \text{ for } i = -1, \dots, -m \tag{4.1}$$

- an equivalence of categories

$$L : \operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A} \to H^0(\mathfrak{b}) \tag{4.2}$$

Note that $H0(\mathfrak{b})$ and $\mathfrak{b}$ have the same objects. So if $I \in \operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}$ then we will view $L(I)$ as an object in both $H^0(\mathfrak{b})$ and $\mathfrak{b}$.

Let $\mathfrak{c}$ be a DG-category such that $\mathfrak{c}(C, C')^n = 0$ for $n > 0$. Then there is an obvious DG-functor $G : \mathfrak{c} \to H^0(\mathfrak{c})$ which is the identity on objects and which on maps $f : C \to C'$ is defined as

$$G(f) = \begin{cases} \text{image of } f \text{ in } H^0(\mathfrak{c}) & \text{if } |f| = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Applying this with $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{b}$ and composing with a quasi-inverse of (4.2) we exhibit a DG-functor

$$G : \mathfrak{b} \to \operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}$$

which sends $L(I)$ to I. The functor G may be extended to a DG-functor[2]

$$G : \mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b} \to \mathrm{Tw}\,\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathrm{Tot}} C^b(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A}) \tag{4.3}$$

and hence to an exact functor

$$H^0(G) : H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b}) \to H^0(C^b(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})) \cong D^b(\mathcal{A}) \tag{4.4}$$

We now state our main technical result.

Theorem 4.1.1. *There is a commutative diagram of additive functors*

(4.5)



where the arrows indicated with $\hookrightarrow$ *are fully faithful, those decorated with "can" are the canonical ones.*

Remark 4.1.2. An obvious generalization to attempt is to replace $\mathfrak{b}$ by a stable model category (or a stable ∞-category). Then one would recover Neeman's result (see (1.1)).

The proof of Theorem 4.1.1 will occupy sections §4.2-§4.5. The functor $\mathcal{A} \to H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})$ is constructed in Lemma 4.2.1. The functor $L : D^b(\mathcal{A}) \to H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})$ is constructed[3] in §4.3. The fact that L is exact is Lemma 4.5.6.

4.2. **Moore objects.** As the title of this section indicates, our constructions are inspired by algebraic topology.

Lemma 4.2.1. *The functor* $L : \mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A} \to H^0(\mathfrak{b})$ *introduced above may be extended to a fully faithful additive functor*

$$L : \mathcal{A} \to H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b}),$$

which moreover satisfies

$$H^0(G) \circ L = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}},$$

where $H^0(G)$ *is as in* (4.4).

Proof. We follow the standard procedure (see e.g. the proof of [40, Prop. 2.6]).

Let $A \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$ and let $0 \to A \to I^\bullet$ be an injective resolution of length m of A. Put $\tilde{I}^n = L(I^n)$ and lift the differentials $d^i : I^i \to I^{i+1}$ to morphism $\tilde{d}^{i,i+1} \in Z^0(\mathfrak{b}(L(I^n), L(I^{n+1})))$. One does not have $\tilde{d}^{i+1,i+2}\tilde{d}^{i,i+1} = 0$ in general but using the hypothesis (4.1) one may complete $(\tilde{d}_{i,i+1})_i$ to a twisted complex $L(A)^\sim =$

[2] $H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,G)$ is more correct but less compact than $H^0(G)$.

[3] As already indicated in the introduction we give two another constructions of the functor L using A_n-functors (see Appendix A). While the latter construction is philosophically satisfying, it does not seem to yield exactness in an obvious way.

$(L(I^i), (\tilde{d}^{ij})_{j>i})$. Of course $L(A)^\sim$ depends on a number of choices, but note that we have canonically

$$G(L(A)^\sim) = I^\bullet,$$

and hence also canonically

$$H^0(G)(L(A)^\sim) = A. \tag{4.6}$$

We will now write $L(A)$ for $L(A)^\sim$ considered as an object in $H^0(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})$. The fact that $A \to L(A)$ yields a fully faithful additive functor now follows from Lemma 4.2.2 below, applied with $i = 0$. □

Lemma 4.2.2. *The functor $H^0(G)$ induces an isomorphism*

$$H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})(L(A)^\sim, \Sigma^i L(B)^\sim)) \xrightarrow{\cong} \operatorname{Ext}^i_{\mathcal{A}}(A, B)$$

for $i \geq 0$.

Proof. let $(\tilde{I}^\bullet, \tilde{d})$, $(\tilde{J}^\bullet, \tilde{d})$ be twisted complexes representing respectively $L(A)^\sim$ and $L(B)^\sim$. Then $\mathfrak{b}(\tilde{I}^\bullet, \tilde{J}^\bullet)$ is a twisted complex over $C(\mathbf{Ab})$. The resulting spectral sequence

$$E_1^{pq} : \bigoplus_{j-i=p} H^q(\mathfrak{b}(\tilde{I}^i, \tilde{J}^j)) \Rightarrow H^{p+q}(\operatorname{Tot}\mathfrak{b}(\tilde{I}^\bullet, \tilde{J}^\bullet))$$

lives in rows $q = 0$ and $q < -m$ and columns $p \in [-m, m]$. The row with $q = 0$ is the complex

$$(\mathcal{A}(I^\bullet, J^\bullet), [d, -])$$

which computes $\operatorname{Ext}^*_{\mathcal{A}}(A, B)$. The conclusion now easily follows. □

4.3. **Derived Moore objects.**

4.3.1. *Filtered objects.* Let $\mathfrak{c}$ be a DG-category. A *graded object* X over $\mathfrak{c}$ is a collection of objects $(X_n)_n$ in $\operatorname{Ob}(\mathfrak{c})$. We make the graded objects into a DG-category $\mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{gr}}$ by putting

$$\mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(X, Y) = \prod_i \mathfrak{c}(X_i, Y_i)$$

We will also define a DG-category $\mathfrak{c}^f$ of *filtered objects* (equipped with an explicit degreewise splitting) over $\mathfrak{c}$. The construction of $\mathfrak{c}^f$ is a variant of the construction of the category of twisted complexes. Filtered objects are finite formal sums $J = \bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} J_i$ with $(J_i)_i \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathfrak{c})$, equipped with a solution $\delta \in \mathfrak{c}(J, J)^1$ to the Maurer Cartan equation $d(\delta) + \delta^2 = 0$ such that $\delta_{ij} : J_i \to J_j$ is zero for $j \geq i$ (we consider ascending filtrations).

Likewise for two filtered objects (J, δ), (J', δ) we have

$$\mathfrak{c}^f((J, \delta), (J', \delta')) = \bigoplus_{i\geq j} \mathfrak{c}(J_i, J_j)$$

equipped with the differential $d^{\mathfrak{c}^f}(f) = d(f) + [\delta, f]$. If $G : \mathfrak{c} \to \mathfrak{d}$ is a DG-functor then there is a corresponding DG-functor $G^f : \mathfrak{c}^f \to \mathfrak{d}^f$.

Given a filtered object J, we set $\omega(J) = ((\Sigma^i J_{-i})_i, \delta) \in \operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{c}$. In this way we obtain a functor $\omega : \mathfrak{c}^f \to \operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{c}$ which forgets the filtration. Similarly, we write $\operatorname{gr}(J)$ for the graded object associated to J obtained by forgetting δ. This is a functor $\operatorname{gr} : \mathfrak{c}^f \to \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{gr}}$. Finally, $J(1)$ is the filtered object satisfying $J(1)_i = J_{i+1}$. The functor $J \mapsto J(1)$ defines a DG-auto-equivalence of $\mathfrak{c}^f$. There is an obvious natural transformation $\mathrm{id} \mapsto ?(1)$ of DG-functors $\mathfrak{c}^f \to \mathfrak{c}^f$, which becomes the identity after

applying ω. It is easy to see that for $J, J' \in \mathfrak{c}^f$ there are exact sequences of complexes

$$0 \to \mathfrak{c}^f(J, J'(-1)) \to \mathfrak{c}^f(J, J') \to \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{gr}(J), \mathrm{gr}(J')) \to 0. \tag{4.7}$$

If $J, J' \in \mathfrak{c}^f$, using the fact that $\mathfrak{c}^f(J, J')$ and $\mathfrak{c}(\omega(J), \omega(J'))$ carry canonical filtrations, the spectral sequence for filtered complexes leads to the following spectral sequences

$$E_2^{pq} = \begin{cases} \oplus_i H^{p+q}(\mathfrak{c}(\mathrm{gr}(J)_i, \mathrm{gr}(J')_{i+q})) & q \leq 0 \\ 0 & q > 0 \end{cases} \Rightarrow H^{p+q}(\mathfrak{c}^f(J, J')) \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$E_2^{pq} = \oplus_i H^{p+q}(\mathfrak{c}(\mathrm{gr}(J)_i, \mathrm{gr}(J')_{i+q})) \Rightarrow H^{p+q}(\mathfrak{c}(\omega(J), \omega(J'))) \tag{4.9}$$

The DG-category $\mathfrak{c}^f$, as well as the exact sequence (4.7) and the spectral sequences (4.8) and (4.9), depend functorially on $\mathfrak{c}$.

Remark 4.3.1. If $\mathfrak{c}$ is a DG-category then $(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{c})^f$ is canonically a triangulated category where the shift functor and cones are computed termwise. The functors $\omega : (\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{c})^f \to \mathrm{Tw}\,\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{c} \cong \mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathrm{gr} : (\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{c})^f \to (\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{c})^{\mathrm{gr}}$ are exact.

4.3.2. *An equivalence of categories.* We define the following categories:

- $C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f_{\mathrm{can}}$ is the full subcategory of $C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f$ consisting of objects J such that for all j the complex $\Sigma^j(\mathrm{gr}(J)_j)$ is isomorphic to an object in $\mathcal{A}$.
- $(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}}$ is the full subcategory of $(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})^f$ consisting of objects J such that, for all j, the twisted complex $\Sigma^j(\mathrm{gr}(J)_j)$ is isomorphic in $H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})$ to an object of the form $L(A) \in H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})$ for $A \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$.

Note that it follows from [4, Prop 3.1.6] that forgetting the filtration defines an equivalence

$$H^0(\omega) : H^0(C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f_{\mathrm{can}}) \to H^0(C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})) \cong D^b(\mathcal{A}) \tag{4.10}$$

This may be proved by comparing the spectral sequences (4.8) and (4.9).

Proposition 4.3.2. *Let $G : \mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b} \to C^b(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})$ be the DG-functor introduced in* (4.3). *The functor $H^0(G^f)$ induces an equivalence*

$$H^0((\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}}) \cong H^0(C^b(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$$

Proof. Lemma 4.3.3 below implies that $H^0(G^f)$, restricted to the indicated categories, is fully faithful. The fact that it is essentially surjective follows from Lemma 4.2.1 in the usual way, by induction on the length of filtrations.

To be more precise assume that $X = (\oplus_n X_n, \delta) \in C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f_{\mathrm{can}}$ and let i, j be respectively the minimal and maximal n such that $X_n \neq 0$. We'll prove by induction on $j - i$ that there is $Y = (\oplus_j Y_j, \delta)$ in $H^0((\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$ such that $H^0(G)(Y) \cong X$ and such $\mathrm{gr}(Y)_n$ is zero in $H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})$ for $n \notin [i, j]$. If $i = j$ then this is by definition. Assume $j > i$. In that case we have a distinguished triangle in $C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f$

$$X_i \to X \to X_{>i} \to$$

with $X_i, X_{>i} \in C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f_{\mathrm{can}}$. So $X = \mathrm{cone}\,u$ for $u \in H^0(C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f(\Sigma^{-1}X_{>i}, X_i))$.

By induction there are objects Y_1, Y_2 in $H^0((\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$ such that $H^0(G^f)(Y_1) = X_i$, $H^0(G^f)(Y_2) = X_{>i}$ and moreover

$$\mathrm{gr}(Y_1)_n = 0 \text{ for } n \neq i \text{ and } \mathrm{gr}(Y_2)_n = 0 \text{ for } n \notin [i+1, j]. \tag{4.11}$$

Furthermore by Lemma 4.3.3 below there exists $v \in H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(\Sigma^{-1}Y_2, Y_1))$ such that $u = G^f(v)$. Put $Y = \operatorname{cone} v$. Then $H^0(G^f)(Y) \cong X$. Furthermore we have a distinguished triangle in $H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f)$

$$Y_1 \to Y \to Y_2 \xrightarrow{v}$$

which for all n gives distinguished triangles in $H^0(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})$:

$$\operatorname{gr}(Y_1)_n \to \operatorname{gr}(Y)_n \to \operatorname{gr}(Y_2)_n \to$$

From this we conclude that $Y \in H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$ using (4.11). □

The following lemma was used.

Lemma 4.3.3. *Assume $X, Y \in (\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}}$. Then $H^0(G^f)$ induces an isomorphism*

$$H^i((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(X,Y)) \to H^i(C(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})^f(G^f(X), G^f(Y))) \tag{4.12}$$

for $i \geq 0$.

Proof. We may compute both sides of (4.12) using the spectral sequence (4.8). Put $\operatorname{gr}(X)_i \cong \Sigma^{-i}L(A_i)\tilde{}$, $\operatorname{gr}(Y)_i \cong \Sigma^{-i}L(B_i)\tilde{}$ for $A_i, B_i \in \mathcal{A}$.

The spectral sequence for $H^i((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(X,Y))$ looks like

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ + & + & + & E_2^{00} & E_2^{10} & E_2^{20} & \cdots \\ + & + & + & E_2^{0,-1} & E_2^{1,-1} & E_2^{2,-1} & \cdots \\ + & + & + & E_2^{0,-2} & E_2^{1,-2} & E_2^{2,-2} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \end{array} \tag{4.13}$$

where the entries marked "+" are irrelevant and where for $p \geq 0$, $q \leq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} E_2^{pq} &= \oplus_i H^{p+q}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})(\Sigma^{-i}L(A_i)\tilde{}, \Sigma^{-i-q}L(B_{i+q})\tilde{})) \\ &= \oplus_i H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})(L(A_i)\tilde{}, \Sigma^p L(B_{i+q})\tilde{})) \\ &= \oplus_i \operatorname{Ext}^p_{\mathcal{A}}(A_i, B_{i+q}) \end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 4.2.2.

Likewise, we find for $H^i(C(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})^f(G^f(X), G^f(Y)))$

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & E_2'^{00} & E_2'^{10} & E_2'^{20} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & E_2'^{0,-1} & E_2'^{1,-1} & E_2'^{2,-2} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & E_2'^{0,-2} & E_2'^{1,-2} & E_2'^{2,-2} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \end{array} \tag{4.14}$$

where for $p \geq 0$, $q \leq 0$

$$E_2'^{pq} = \oplus_i \operatorname{Ext}^p_{\mathcal{A}}(A_i, B_{i+q})$$

The functor G induces a morphism of spectral sequences (4.13)→(4.14), which induces an isomorphism $E_2^{pq} \to E_2'^{pq}$ for $p \geq 0$ by Lemma 4.3.3.

By induction, one sees that the E_u^{pq} entries for the two spectral sequences remain the same for $p \geq 0$ and any u. Indeed, if this is true for a given u, then by applying

G we get commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} + & \longrightarrow & E_u^{pq} \\ \downarrow & & \| G \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & E_u'^{pq} \end{array}$$

from which we see that all the maps $+ \to E_u^{pq}$ must be zero. We conclude that $E_\infty^{pq} \to E_\infty'^{pq}$ is an isomorphism for $p \geq 0$. This finishes the proof. □

4.3.3. *Derived Moore objects.* We now define the functor

$$L : D^b(\mathcal{A}) \to H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b}) \tag{4.15}$$

as the composition

$$D^b(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{H^0(\omega)^{-1}} H^0(C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f_{\mathrm{can}}) \xrightarrow{H^0(G^f)^{-1}} H^0((\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}}) \xrightarrow{H^0(\omega)} H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})$$

where the first arrow is the inverse of (4.10) and the existence of the middle arrow is derived from Proposition 4.3.2. We record the following

Lemma 4.3.4. *With L as in* (4.15) *one has*

$$H^0(G) \circ L \cong \mathrm{id}\,.$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the following fact

$$H^0(G) \circ H^0(\omega) = H^0(G \circ \omega) = H^0(\omega \circ G^f) = H^0(\omega) \circ H^0(G^f). \quad \square$$

4.4. **Massey products.** In order to prove that the functor defined in Lemma 4.3.3 is exact we will use Massey products. For the benefit of the reader we review some of the properties we use. See also [33].

4.4.1. *Massey products in triangulated categories.* Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category and assume that there are maps

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} U$$

in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $gf = 0$, $hg = 0$. Then the *set of Massey products* $\langle h, g, f\rangle \subset \mathrm{Hom}^{-1}(X, U)$ is the (non-empty!) set of arrows b completing the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \xrightarrow{h} & U \\ \| & & \| & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle a} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle b} \\ X & \xrightarrow[f]{} & Y & \xrightarrow[i]{} & C & \xrightarrow[q]{} & \Sigma X \end{array} \tag{4.16}$$

where the lower row is a distinguished triangle.

Lemma 4.4.1. *The set $\langle h, g, f\rangle$ is a coset of $h\,\mathrm{Hom}^{-1}(X, Z) + \mathrm{Hom}^{-1}(Y, U)f$ inside* $\mathrm{Hom}^{-1}(X, U)$.

Proof. Since all distinguished triangles with given base $f : X \to Y$ are isomorphic, we only have to consider a fixed one as the lower row for the diagram (4.16). A different choice a', b' for a, b leads to a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \xrightarrow{h} & U & & \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle 0} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle 0} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle a'-a} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle b'-b} & & \\ X & \xrightarrow[f]{} & Y & \xrightarrow[i]{} & C & \xrightarrow[q]{} & \Sigma X & \xrightarrow[f]{} & \Sigma Y \end{array}$$

Hence $a' - a = pq$ for $p : \Sigma X \to Z$, and so $(b' - b)q = hpq$. It follows that $b' - b - hp = p'f$ for $p' : \Sigma Y \to U$. Summarizing,

$$a' = a + pq$$
$$b' = b + hp + p'f.$$

Conversely, given p, p' we may compute a', b' by these formulas, and it is clear that the latter complete the diagram (4.16). □

The next two lemmas follow straight from the definitions:

Lemma 4.4.2. *In a distinguished triangle*

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X$$

we have

$$\mathrm{id}_X \in \langle h, g, f\rangle.$$

Lemma 4.4.3. *Assume that we have a triangle*

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X$$

(thus in particular satisfying $gf = 0$, $hg = 0$). Then we may construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \xrightarrow{h} & \Sigma X \\ \| & & \| & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle x} & & \| \\ X & \xrightarrow[f]{} & Y & \xrightarrow[i]{} & C & \xrightarrow[q]{} & \Sigma X \end{array}$$

with the lower row a distinguished triangle, if and only if $\mathrm{id}_X \in \langle h, g, f\rangle$.

We will use the following criterion for recognizing distinguished triangles:

Theorem 4.4.4. *Assume that $L : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$ is an additive functor between triangulated categories which*

1. *commutes with shifts;*
2. *has an exact left inverse (i.e. an exact, in particular additive, functor $G : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$ satisfying $G \circ L \cong \mathrm{id}$), reflecting isomorphisms.*

Assume that

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X$$

is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\langle h, g, f\rangle$ contains an element ϕ such that $L(\phi) \in \langle L(h), L(g), L(f)\rangle$. Then the triangle in $\mathcal{T}$

$$LX \xrightarrow{Lf} LY \xrightarrow{Lg} LZ \xrightarrow{Lh} \Sigma LX$$

is distinguished.

Proof. By Lemmas 4.4.1, the additivity of L and the hypothesis $L(\phi) \in \langle L(h), L(g), L(f)\rangle$ we obtain $L\langle h, g, f\rangle \subset \langle Lh, Lg, Lf\rangle$. By Lemma 4.4.2 we have $\mathrm{id}_X \in \langle h, g, f\rangle$. Combining this we obtain

$$\mathrm{id}_{LX} = L\mathrm{id}_X \in L\langle h, g, f\rangle \subset \langle Lh, Lg, Lf\rangle.$$

By Lemma 4.4.3 we may construct a commutative diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} LX & \xrightarrow{Lf} & LY & \xrightarrow{Lg} & LZ & \xrightarrow{Lh} & \Sigma LX \\ \| & & \| & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle x} & & \| \\ LX & \xrightarrow[Lf]{} & LY & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & \Sigma LX \end{array}$$

with the lower row being a distinguished triangle.

Applying the exact functor G, we obtain a commutative diagram in which both the upper and lower row are distinguished:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \xrightarrow{h} & \Sigma X \\ \| & & \| & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle Gx} & & \| \\ X & \xrightarrow[f]{} & Y & \longrightarrow & GC & \longrightarrow & \Sigma X \end{array}$$

So Gx is an isomorphism; but then so is x by the hypothesis that G reflects isomorphisms. □

We now extract some technical corollaries from this result which will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.5.6 below.

Corollary 4.4.5. *Assume that assumptions (1,2) hold in the statement of Theorem 4.4.4. If*

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X$$

is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{S}$ such that L induces an isomorphism $\mathcal{S}(X, X) \to \mathcal{T}(LX, LX)$, then

$$LX \xrightarrow{Lf} LY \xrightarrow{Lg} LZ \xrightarrow{Lh} \Sigma LX$$

is a distinguished triangle in $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. Pick $\theta \in \langle Lh, Lg, Lf\rangle \subset \mathcal{T}(LX, LX)$. Then since G is exact $\phi \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} G(\theta) \in \langle h, g, f\rangle \subset \mathcal{S}(X, X)$. Since by the hypotheses L, G are inverses on $\mathcal{S}(X, X)$ and $\mathcal{T}(LX, LX)$ we have $L(\phi) = \theta \in \langle Lh, Lg, Lf\rangle$. It follows that the hypotheses for Theorem 4.4.4 hold and hence the conclusion follows. □

Corollary 4.4.6. *Assume that assumptions (1,2) hold in the statement of Theorem 4.4.4. Assume that we have the following diagram in $\mathcal{S}$*

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} U$$

satisfying $gf = 0$, $hg = 0$. Assume furthermore that $\mathcal{S}^{-1}(X, U) = 0$ and that L induces an isomorphism $\mathcal{S}(X, X) \to \mathcal{T}(LX, LX)$. Then

$$0 \in \langle L(h), L(g), L(f)\rangle$$

Proof. Consider a commutative diagram in $\mathcal{S}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \xrightarrow{h} & U \\ \| & & \| & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle x} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle 0} \\ X & \xrightarrow[f]{} & Y & \xrightarrow[i]{} & C(f) & \xrightarrow[p]{} & \Sigma X \end{array}$$

where the rightmost arrow must be zero since $\mathcal{S}^{-1}(X, U) = 0$. Applying L yields a commutative diagram in $\mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} L(X) & \xrightarrow{L(f)} & L(Y) & \xrightarrow{L(g)} & L(Z) & \xrightarrow{L(h)} & L(U) \\ \| & & \| & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle L(x)} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle 0} \\ L(X) & \xrightarrow[L(f)]{} & L(Y) & \xrightarrow[L(i)]{} & L(C(f)) & \xrightarrow[L(p)]{} & \Sigma L(X) \end{array}$$

The lower triangle is distinguished because of Corollary 4.4.5. Hence the conclusion follows. □

4.4.2. *Massey products in DG-categories.* Assume that $\mathfrak{b}$ is a DG-category and that there are morphisms

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} U \tag{4.17}$$

in $H^0(\mathfrak{b})$ such that $gf = 0$, $hg = 0$. Then the *set of Massey products* $\langle h, g, f\rangle \subset H^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}(X, U))$ is the set of elements $b \in H^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}(X, U))$ that may be obtained by the following procedure:

(1) Lift f, g, h to morphisms $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{h}$ in $Z^0\mathfrak{b}$.
(2) Choose $s \in \mathfrak{b}(X, Z)^{-1}$, $t \in \mathfrak{b}(Y, U)^{-1}$ such that $ds = \tilde{g}\tilde{f}$, $dt = \tilde{h}\tilde{g}$.
(3) Put $\tilde{b} = hs - tf$. Then $d\tilde{b} = 0$.
(4) Let b be the image of $\tilde{b}$ in $H^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}(X, U))$.

One has the following obvious parallel to Lemma 4.4.1.

Lemma 4.4.7. *The set $\langle h, g, f\rangle$ is a coset of $hH^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}(X, Z)) + H^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}(Y, U))f$ inside $H^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}(X, U))$.*

Furthermore one has the following fact:

Lemma 4.4.8. *Assume that $\mathfrak{b}$ is an enhanced triangulated category* [8] *(i.e. $H^0(\mathfrak{b}) \to H^0(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})$ is an equivalence and so $H^0(\mathfrak{b})$ is triangulated). Then the Massey products defined in this section and in the previous section coincide.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may replace $\mathfrak{b}$ with $\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b}$, considered embedded in $\operatorname{Mod}(\mathfrak{b}^\circ)$ by the Yoneda embedding. Then to compute the Massey product of (4.17) with the method exhibited in the previous section we may use the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \xrightarrow{h} & U \\ \| & & \| & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle a} & \nearrow{\scriptstyle q} & \uparrow{\scriptstyle b} \\ X & \xrightarrow[f]{} & Y & \xrightarrow[i]{} & C(f) & \xrightarrow[p]{} & \Sigma X \end{array}$$

(to simplify the notation we have dropped the ˜'s) where

$$C(f) = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma X \\ Y \end{pmatrix}$$

$$d_{C(f)} = \begin{pmatrix} d_{\Sigma X} & 0 \\ f & d_Y \end{pmatrix}$$

$$i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$p = (1\ 0)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} ds &= gf \\ dt &= hg \\ a &= (s\ g) \\ b &= hs - tf \\ q &= (0\ t) \qquad \text{(the homotopy making the rightmost square commute)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence we find the same result. □

We now consider the filtered case.

Lemma 4.4.9. *Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be a DG-category as before, and assume that there are morphism in $H^0(\mathfrak{b}^f)$*

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} U$$

such that $gf = 0$, $hg = 0$. Then for all $\phi \in \langle h, g, f\rangle$ and for all i we have

$$\mathrm{gr}(\phi)_i \in \langle \mathrm{gr}(h)_i, \mathrm{gr}(g)_i, \mathrm{gr}(f)_i\rangle$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the construction of $\langle h, g, f\rangle$. □

4.5. **Exactness of L.** In this section we prove that the functor $L : D^b(\mathcal{A}) \to H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})$ constructed in §4.3.3 is exact.

This result is not as obvious as it should be, since $H^0(C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$ and $H^0((\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$ are not triangulated subcategories of $H^0(C(\mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A})^f)$ and $H^0((\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b})^f)$ (they are in particular not closed under the shift functor). So we have to work harder.

However, note that these categories are closed under the functor $J \mapsto \Sigma J(1)$ and its inverse. From this we easily deduce using the definition of L in §4.3.3 that L commutes with shifts. So we only have to show that it preserves distinguished triangles.

We will appeal to Theorem 4.4.4, with $H^0(G)$ playing the role of G in the statements of this result. The fact that hypothesis (1) is satisfied has already been mentioned, and the fact that (2) is satisfied follows from Lemma 4.3.4 and the next lemma.

Lemma 4.5.1. *The functor $H^0(G)$ in diagram (4.5) reflects isomorphisms.*

Proof. This is a special case of the next lemma. □

Lemma 4.5.2. *Let $\mathfrak{c}$ be a DG-category concentrated in degrees ≤ 0 and let $G : \mathfrak{c} \to H^0(\mathfrak{c})$ be the canonical DG-functor (see §4.1). Then the functor $H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,G)$ reflects isomorphisms.*

Proof. Since $\operatorname{Tw} G$ is exact it is sufficient to prove that it reflects zero objects.

To prove this, we consider $\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{c}$ as being embedded in $\operatorname{Mod}(\mathfrak{c}^\circ)$ through the Yoneda embedding $C \mapsto \mathfrak{c}(-, C)$. Let N be in the essential image of this embedding. Then N is a repeated extension of representable functors, hence it is cofibrant for the "projective" model structure for which all surjective maps are fibrations. It also follows that $N \in D^-(\mathfrak{c})$.

Assume that i is maximal such that $H^i(N) \neq 0$. We will prove

$$H^i((\operatorname{Tw} G)(N)) = H^i(N).$$

Hence $N \neq 0$ implies $(\operatorname{Tw} G)(N) \neq 0$.

Let K be a cofibrant resolution of $H^0(\mathfrak{c})$ as $\mathfrak{c}-\mathfrak{c}$-bimodule concentrated in degrees ≤ 0. Then K is also cofibrant on the left.

We have the following chain of quasi-isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}(\operatorname{Tw} G)(N) &\cong N \otimes_{\mathfrak{c}} H^0(\mathfrak{c}) \\ &\cong N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathfrak{c}} K \\ &\cong \tau_{\leq i} N \otimes_{\mathfrak{c}} K\end{aligned}$$

The first isomorphims is by construction, the second quasi-isomorphism is by the fact that N is cofibrant and the third quasi-isomorphism is by the fact that K is cofibrant.

Finally one checks $H^i(\tau_{\leq i} N \otimes_{\mathfrak{c}} K) = H^i(N) \otimes_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})} H^0(K) = H^i(N)$, finishing the proof. □

Having verified that the hypotheses of Theorem 4.4.4 hold we now start with the actual work for proving the exactness of L.

Lemma 4.5.3. *Let $X, Y \in \operatorname{Ob}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\operatorname{can}})$. Then there is an exact sequence*

(4.18)
$$H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(X, Y[-1](-1))) \to H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(X, Y[-1])) \to H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^{\operatorname{gr}}(\operatorname{gr}(X), \operatorname{gr}(Y)[-1])) \to 0$$

Proof. One may establish the existence of the exact sequence in a similar way as the proof of Lemma 4.3.3 by inspecting the spectral sequence (4.8) for $(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f$.

Instead we will give a direct argument based on (4.7). From that result, one sees that the only thing that needs to be shown is the surjectivity on the rightmost non-trivial arrow in (4.18). In other words we must show that the boundary map

$$H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^{\operatorname{gr}}(\operatorname{gr}(X), \operatorname{gr}(Y)[-1])) \to H^1((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(X, Y[-1](-1)))$$

is zero. This follows by inspecting the following commutative square which follows from the functoriality of (4.7) and Lemma 4.3.3

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^{\operatorname{gr}}(\operatorname{gr}(X), \operatorname{gr}(Y)[-1])) & \longrightarrow & H^1((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(X, Y[-1](-1))) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^1(C(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})^f(G^f(X), G^f(Y)[-1](-1))) \end{array}$$

□

Lemma 4.5.4. *Assume that we have a diagram in $H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f)$*

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} U, \tag{4.19}$$

with $X, Y, Z, U \in (\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\operatorname{can}}$ and $gf = 0$, $hg = 0$. Then $\langle h, g, f\rangle_{(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f} \subset H^{-1}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(X, U))$ contains elements that factor through $U[-1](-1)$.

Proof. Using Lemma 4.5.3, we see that it is sufficient to prove that there exists $\phi \in \langle h, g, f\rangle_{(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f}$ such that $\operatorname{gr}(\phi) = 0$. By Lemma 4.4.9 we know that $\operatorname{gr}(\phi)_i \in \langle \operatorname{gr}(h)_i, \operatorname{gr}(g)_i, \operatorname{gr}(f)_i\rangle_{\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b}}$.

Now since $X, Y, Z, U \in (\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}}$ we have by definition in $H^0(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})$: $\operatorname{gr}(X)_i = L(A_i)[-i]$, $\operatorname{gr}(Y)_i = L(B_i)[-i]$, $\operatorname{gr}(Z)_i = L(C_i)[-i]$, $\operatorname{gr}(U)_i = L(D_i)[-i]$ for $A_i, B_i, C_i, D_i \in \mathcal{A}$, and by Lemma 4.2.2 there are $f_i : A_i \to B_i$, $g_i : B_i \to C_i$, $h_i : C_i \to D_i$ in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $L(f_i)[-i] = \operatorname{gr}(f)_i$, $L(g_i)[-i] = \operatorname{gr}(g)_i$, $L(h_i)[-i] = \operatorname{gr}(h)_i$. By Corollary 4.4.6 and Lemma 4.4.7 we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}(4.20)\quad &\langle \operatorname{gr}(h)_i, \operatorname{gr}(g)_i, \operatorname{gr}(f)_i\rangle_{\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b}} = \\ &H^{-1}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})(\operatorname{gr}(Y)_i, \operatorname{gr}(U)_i))\operatorname{gr}(f)_i + \operatorname{gr}(h)_i H^{-1}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})(\operatorname{gr}(X)_i, \operatorname{gr}(Z)_i))\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 4.5.3 again we see that the maps

$$\begin{aligned}(4.21)\quad &H^{-1}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(Y,U)) \to \bigoplus_i H^{-1}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})(\operatorname{gr}(Y)_i, \operatorname{gr}(U)_i)) \\ &H^{-1}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f(X,Z)) \to \bigoplus_i H^{-1}((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})(\operatorname{gr}(X)_i, \operatorname{gr}(Z)_i)\end{aligned}$$

are surjective. This means that, starting with an arbitrary $\phi \in \langle h, g, f\rangle_{(\operatorname{Tw}b)^f}$, we may using (4.20) and (4.21) move it in its coset (Lemma 4.4.7) in such a way that $\operatorname{gr}(\phi) = 0$. This finishes the proof. □

Lemma 4.5.5. *The functor L preserves Massey products.*

Proof. Let

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} U$$

be a diagram in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ satisfying $gf = 0$, $hg = 0$, and let

$$X'' \xrightarrow{f''} Y'' \xrightarrow{g''} Z'' \xrightarrow{h''} U''$$

be the correspnding diagram in $H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$ obtained by applying $H^0(G^f)^{-1} \circ H^0(\omega)^{-1}$. In rest of the proof we will drop the use of H^0 to compactify the notation.

By Lemma 4.5.4 we see that there exists $\psi \in \langle h'', g'', f''\rangle_{(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f}$ which factors as $X'' \xrightarrow{\phi''} U''[-1](-1) \to U''[-1]$. Put $\phi = \omega(G^f(\psi)) = \omega(G^f(\phi'')) \in \langle h, g, f\rangle_{D^b(\mathcal{A})}$. Since $U''[-1](-1) \in (\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}}$ we have using the definition in §4.3.3 $L(\phi) = \omega(G^f)^{-1}\omega^{-1}(\phi) = \omega(\phi'') = \omega(\psi) \in \omega(\langle h'', g'', f''\rangle_{(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f}) \subset \langle \omega(h''), \omega(g''), \omega(f'')\rangle = \langle L(h), L(g), L(f)\rangle$. The result now follows from Lemma 4.4.1 and the additivity of L. □

Lemma 4.5.6. *The functor L is exact.*

Proof. This follows by combining Lemma 4.5.5 with Theorem 4.4.4. □

5. Derived Injectives

5.1. **The general case.** This is part of ongoing work of the second author with Wendy Lowen [27]. Assume that $\mathcal{D}$ is a well generated triangulated category equipped with a t-structure with heart $\mathcal{B}$. If $I \in \operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{B}$, by Brown representability [37] the cohomological functor $\mathcal{D} \mapsto \mathbf{Ab}$ given by $\mathcal{B}(H^0(-), I)$ is representable. Denote the representing object by $L(I)$. So we have that for $X \in \mathcal{D}$

$$\mathcal{B}(H^0(X), I) = \mathcal{D}(X, L(I)). \tag{5.1}$$

We will call $L(I)$ the *derived injective* associated to I.

Remark 5.1.1. If $\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Sp})$ is the homotopy category of spectra with the standard t-structure with heart $\mathbf{Ab}$ and $I = \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, then $L(I)$ is the Brown-Comenetz dual of the sphere spectrum.

The following properties are easily verified:

$$L(I) \in \mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}, \tag{5.2}$$

$$H^0(L(I)) = I. \tag{5.3}$$

For $I, J \in \operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{B}$, one has

$$\mathcal{D}(L(I), \Sigma^i L(J)) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{B}(I,J) & \text{if } i = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

Thus, in particular, we have a fully faithful functor

$$L : \operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{D} : I \mapsto L(I). \tag{5.5}$$

5.2. **Derived injectives in a DG-category.** Now assume that $\mathcal{D}$ is $D(\mathfrak{c})$ with $\mathfrak{c}$ a DG-category concentrated in degrees ≤ 0. Equip $\mathcal{D}$ with the standard t-structure with heart $\mathcal{B} = \mathrm{Mod}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}))$. One verifies for $I \in \operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{B}$

$$H^*(L(I)) = \mathrm{Hom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(H^{-*}(\mathfrak{c}), I) \tag{5.6}$$

as graded $H^*(\mathfrak{c})$-modules. We also find

(5.7)

$$\mathrm{Hom}^i_{D(\mathfrak{c})}(L(I), L(J)) = \mathrm{Hom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(H^{-i}(L(I)), J) = \mathrm{Hom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(\mathrm{Hom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(H^i(\mathfrak{c}), I), J)$$

Finally note the following

Lemma 5.2.1. *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{Inj} \mathrm{Mod}(H^0(\mathfrak{c})) & \xrightarrow{L} & D(\mathfrak{c}) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}),-)} \\ & & D(H^0(\mathfrak{c})) \end{array}$$

were the horizontal map is obtained from (5.5).

Proof. Let $I \in \operatorname{Inj} \mathrm{Mod}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}))$. We have to contruct a natural isomorphism

$$\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(I)) \cong I \tag{5.8}$$

in $D(H^0(\mathfrak{c}))$. Let $Y \in D(H^0(\mathfrak{c}))$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(Y, \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(I))) &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(Y, L(I)) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(H^0(Y), I) = \mathrm{Hom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(Y, I) \end{aligned}$$

The first equality if "change of rings", the second equality is (5.1) and the last equality is because I is injective. The isomorphism (5.8) now follows by Yoneda's lemma. □

5.3. **A variation on Theorem 4.1.1.**

Proposition 5.3.1. *Let $\mathfrak{c}$ be a DG-category concentrated in degree ≤ 0, satisfying in addition*

$$H^i(\mathfrak{c}) = 0 \qquad \text{for } i = -1, \dots, -m$$

and assume that there is a full subcategory $\mathcal{A} \subset \operatorname{Mod}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}))$ such that

- *$\mathcal{A}$ has enough injectives and $\operatorname{gl\,dim} \mathcal{A} \leq m$.*
- *$\operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{A} \subset \operatorname{Inj} \operatorname{Mod} H^0(\mathfrak{c})$ (and hence $D^b(\mathcal{A}) \subset D^b(H^0(\mathfrak{c}))$).*

Then there is a commutative diagram of additive functors

(5.9)
$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{L} & D(\mathfrak{c}) & & \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle can} & & \| & & \\
\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{L} & D(\mathfrak{c}) & & \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle can} & & \| & & \\
D^b(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow[exact]{L} & D(\mathfrak{c}) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}),-)} & D^b(H^0(\mathfrak{c})) \\
 & \searrow^{can} & & & \nearrow_{can}
\end{array}$$

where the arrows indicated with $\hookrightarrow$ are fully faithful, those decorated with "can" are the canonical ones. Furthermore the top arrow is the functor L introduced in (5.5) *(with $\mathcal{D} = D(\mathfrak{c})$).*

Proof. Let $\operatorname{Fib}(\mathfrak{c})$ be the category of fibrant objects in $\underline{\operatorname{Mod}}(\mathfrak{c})$ for the standard "injective" model structure for which the cofibrations are the injective maps. For each I in $\operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{A}$ we choose a representative of $L(I)$ in $\operatorname{Fib}(\mathfrak{c})$ which we also denote by $L(I)$. Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the following DG-category.

- The objects are of the form $L(I) \in \operatorname{Fib}(\mathfrak{c})$ for $I \in \operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{A}$.
- For the morphisms we set

$$\mathfrak{b}(L(I), L(J)) = \tau_{\leq 0} \operatorname{Fib}(\mathfrak{c})(L(I), L(J)),$$

where $\tau_{\leq 0}$ is the standard smart truncation functor on complexes.

Then $\mathfrak{b}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 4.1.1. Furthermore $H^0(\mathfrak{b}) \to H^0(\operatorname{Fib} \mathfrak{c})$ is fully faithful and it is easy to see that this implies the same for $H^0(\operatorname{Tw} \mathfrak{b}) \to H^0(\operatorname{Tw} \operatorname{Fib} \mathfrak{c})$.

The commutative diagram (5.9) is a subdiagram of the following larger commutative diagram



The two leftmost columns are obtained from Theorem 4.1.1 and hence in particular the three leftmost squares are commutative. The three rightmost square are commutative on the nose and so are the two top middle squares. The lower middle square is obtained by applying the functor $H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,-)$ to the following diagram of DG-categories.

(5.10)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{b} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Fib}\,\mathfrak{c} \\ {\scriptstyle G}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}),-)} \\ \mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Fib}\,H^0(\mathfrak{c}) \end{array}$$

where the lower horizontal arrow sends $I \in \mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A}$ to itself, considered as fibrant complex over $H^0(\mathfrak{c})$. We immediately see that (5.10) is not commutative. Indeed the upper and lower diagonal compositions are respectively given by

$$\begin{aligned} u :& \mathfrak{b} \to \mathrm{Fib}\,H^0(\mathfrak{c}) : L(I) \mapsto \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(I)) \\ l :& \mathfrak{b} \to \mathrm{Fib}\,H^0(\mathfrak{c}) : L(I) \mapsto I \end{aligned}$$

We clearly have $u \neq l$. So we need to verify $H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,u) \cong H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,l)$.

Since $L(I) \in \mathrm{Fib}\,\mathfrak{c}$, we have $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(I)) \in \mathrm{Fib}\,H^0(\mathfrak{c})$. By Lemma 5.2.1 we have $H^*(\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(I))) = I$ and hence by Lemma 5.3.3 below $\tau_{\leq 0}\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(I)) \in \mathrm{Fib}\,H^0(\mathfrak{c})$.

Now define

$$m : \mathfrak{b} \to \mathrm{Fib}\,H^0(\mathfrak{c}) : L(I) \mapsto \tau_{\leq 0}\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(I))$$

Then we have obvious natural transformations

$$u \leftarrow m \to l$$

which yield quasi-isomorphisms when evaluated on $I \in \mathrm{Inj}\,\mathcal{A}$. Hence $H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,u) \cong H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,m) \cong H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,l)$ are we are done. □

Corollary 5.3.2. *If $X \in D^b(\mathcal{A})$ and $N \in D^b(H^0(\mathfrak{c}) \otimes H^0(\mathfrak{c})^\circ)$ then*

$$\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(N, L(X)) \cong \mathrm{RHom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(N, X) \tag{5.11}$$

in $D^b(H^0(\mathfrak{c}))$.

Proof. By the standard "change of rings" identity we have

$$\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(N, L(X)) = \mathrm{RHom}_{H^0(\mathfrak{c})}(N, \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(X))).$$

Using the lower row in (5.9), we obtain

$$\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{c}}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), L(X)) \cong X.$$

This finishes the proof. □

The following basic fact was used in the proof of Proposition 5.3.1.

Lemma 5.3.3. *Assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is a Grothendieck category and $I^\bullet$ is a fibrant object for the model structure on $C(\mathcal{C})$ for which the cofibrations are the injective maps. Assume that $I^\bullet$ has injective cohomology. Then $\tau_{\leq n} I^\bullet$ is fibrant for any n.*

Proof. Let us write $H^*(I^\bullet)$ for the complex with zero differential $\oplus_i \Sigma^{-i} H^i(I^\bullet)$. To prove the lemma it is sufficient to show that $I^\bullet$ is the direct sum of $H^*(I^\bullet)$ and a series of complexes C_i of the form $(J_i \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}} J_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ concentrated in degrees $i-1, i$ with J_i injective. This is of course well-known but for lack of a reference let us give the proof.

Using the fact that $H^*(I^\bullet)$ has injective terms we may contruct a quasi-isomorphism $p : I^\bullet \to H^*(I^\bullet)$. Since $I^\bullet$ and $H^*(I^\bullet)$ are both fibrant, this quasi-isomorphism has a homotopy inverse $i : H^*(I^\bullet) \to I^\bullet$. Since $H^*(I^\bullet)$ has zero differential the composition pi is the identity. So p is degreewise split and thus $J^\bullet := \ker p$ is fibrant and acyclic. Therefore $J^\bullet$ is a sum of complexes of the form C_i as introduced above. Furthermore since $J^\bullet \to 0$ is an acyclic fibration $\mathrm{Hom}_{Z^0C(\mathcal{C})}(-, J^\bullet)$ sends injective maps of complexes to surjections. In other words $J^\bullet$ is injective in $Z^0C(\mathcal{C})$. Thus $I^\bullet \cong H^*(I^\bullet) \oplus J^\bullet$ and we are done. □

6. Deformations

6.1. **A_∞-deformations of linear categories.** If $\mathfrak{a}$ is a k-linear category and M is a k-central $\mathfrak{a}$-bimodule, we write $\mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ for the Hochschild complex of M and $\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ for its subcomplex of normalized cochains (i.e. those cochains vanishing on identity morphisms). The inclusion $\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, M) \to \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ is a quasi-isomorphism by [25, §1.5.7]. We write $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ for the corresponding cohomology. Note that we have

$$\mathrm{HH}^n(\mathfrak{a}, M) = \mathrm{Ext}^n_{\mathfrak{a}\otimes_k \mathfrak{a}^\circ}(\mathfrak{a}, M).$$

Now let $\eta \in Z^n \bar{\mathbf{C}}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, M)$. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$ be the DG-category $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \Sigma^{n-2} M$ whose composition is coming from the composition in $\mathfrak{a}$ and the action of $\mathfrak{a}$ on M.

We denote by $\mathfrak{a}_\eta$ the A_∞-category $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$, with deformed A_∞-structure given by

$$b_{\mathfrak{a}_\eta} = b_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}} + \eta,$$

where we view η as a map of degree one $(\Sigma\mathfrak{a})^{\otimes n} \to \Sigma(\Sigma^{n-2}M)$ and extend it to a map $\eta : (\Sigma\mathfrak{a}_\eta)^{\otimes n} \to \Sigma\mathfrak{a}_\eta$ of degree one by making the unspecified components zero. Clearly we have $H^*(\mathfrak{a}_\eta) = \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$. Furthermore, since η is normalized, it is clear that $\mathfrak{a}_\eta$ is strictly unital.

Lemma 6.1.1. *If η, η' represent the same element of $\mathrm{HH}^n(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ then there is an A_∞-isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{a}_\eta \to \mathfrak{a}_{\eta'}$ whose only non-trivial component is of the form*

$$f_{n-1} : (\Sigma\mathfrak{a})^{\otimes n-1} \to \Sigma(\Sigma^{n-2}M)$$

Proof. This is an easy and standard verification. □

Because the construction of $\mathfrak{a}_\eta$ only depends on the cohomology class of η, we will often write $\mathfrak{a}_{\bar{\eta}}$ with $\bar{\eta} \in \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ to denote $\mathfrak{a}_\eta$, where η is a lift of $\bar{\eta}$ to $Z^n\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, M)$.

6.2. **Tensoring with a DG-category.** Let $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$ be k-linear DG-categories, and let M be a k-central $\mathfrak{a}$-bimodule. Then then there is a morphism of complexes

$$\mathbf{C}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \to \mathbf{C}(\mathfrak{a} \otimes_k \mathfrak{b}, M \otimes_k \mathfrak{b}) : \eta \mapsto \eta \cup 1$$

where $\eta \cup 1$ is defined by (for suitable composable arrows)

$$(\eta \cup 1)(a_1 \otimes b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n \otimes b_n) = \pm\eta(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \otimes b_1 \cdots b_n$$

with the sign given by the Koszul convention. It is easy to see that on the level of cohomology $\eta \cup 1$ has the usual interpretation as a map

$$\mathrm{Ext}^*_{\mathfrak{a}\otimes_k\mathfrak{b}^\circ}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \to \mathrm{Ext}^*_{\mathfrak{a}\otimes_k\mathfrak{b}\otimes_k\mathfrak{a}^\circ\otimes_k\mathfrak{b}^\circ}(\mathfrak{a} \otimes_k \mathfrak{b}, M \otimes_k \mathfrak{b})$$

where 1 now refers to the identity element of $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{b}\otimes_k\mathfrak{b}^\circ}(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{b})$.

It is nontrivial to construct the tensor product of two A_∞-categories. However, no difficulty arises when one of the A_∞-categories is a DG-category: this is a special case of tensoring an algebra over an asymmetric operad with a DG-algebra, where again only suitable composable arrows should be considered. Specifically, assume that $\mathfrak{a}$ is a k-A_∞-category and $\mathfrak{b}$ is a k-DG-category. Then we define

$$b^n_{\mathfrak{a}\otimes_k\mathfrak{b}}(s(a_1 \otimes b_1), \ldots, s(a_n \otimes b_n)) = \pm b^n_{\mathfrak{a}}(sa_1, \ldots, sa_n) \otimes b_1 \cdots b_n$$
$$b^1_{\mathfrak{a}\otimes_k\mathfrak{b}}(s(a \otimes b)) = b^1(sa) \otimes b + (-1)^{|sa|} sa \otimes d(b)$$

(for suitably composable arrows) where the sign is given by the Koszul convention after making the identification $s(a_i \otimes_k b_i) = (sa_i) \otimes_k b_i$.

With this definition is easy to see that, if $\eta \in Z^n\bar{\mathbf{C}}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ and $\eta \cup 1 \in \bar{\mathbf{C}}(\mathfrak{a} \otimes_k \mathfrak{b}, M \otimes_k \mathfrak{b})$ is the extended cocycle, then

$$\mathfrak{a}_\eta \otimes \mathfrak{b} = (\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathfrak{b})_{\eta\cup 1}.$$

6.3. **The characteristic morphism.** Let N be an $\mathfrak{a}$-module. Then there is a so-called characteristic map [26]

$$c_N : \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathfrak{a}, M) \to \mathrm{Ext}^n_{\mathfrak{a}}(N, M \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathfrak{a}} N),$$

which may be constructed by interpreting $\eta \in \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ as a map $\mathfrak{a} \to \Sigma^n M$ in $D(\mathfrak{a} \otimes_k \mathfrak{a}^\circ)$. Applying the functor $- \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathfrak{a}} N$ to η we obtain a map $N \to \Sigma^n M \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathfrak{a}} N$ which is $c_N(\eta)$.

There is a dual characteristic map

$$c_N : \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathfrak{a}, M) \to \mathrm{Ext}^n_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{a}}(M, N), N),$$

obtained by applying $\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathfrak{a}}(-, N)$ to η. For the sequel we note the following obvious fact.

Lemma 6.3.1. *Assume that M is an invertible $\mathfrak{a}$-bimodule. In that case we have a commutative diagram*



In other words in the context of Lemma 6.3.1 we do not have to make a distinction between the two characteristic maps.

Now assume that M is right flat over $\mathfrak{a}$. It is well-known that in that case c_N can be constructed directly on the level of complexes. One starts with the identification

$$\mathrm{Ext}^n_{\mathfrak{a}}(N, M \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} N) = \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathfrak{a}, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_k(N, M \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} N)).$$

With this identification c_N is obtained by passing to cohomology from the map of complexes

$$c_N : \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, M) \to \mathbf{C}^\bullet(\mathfrak{a}, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_k(N, M \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} N)),$$

which is obtained from the obvious map of $\mathfrak{a}$-bimodules

$$M \to \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_k(N, M \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} N). \tag{6.1}$$

A similar statement holds for c_N^*. In this case (6.1) is replaced by the equally obvious map of $\mathfrak{a}$-bimodules

$$M \to \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_k(\mathrm{Hom}(M, N), N).$$

6.4. **Deformation of objects.** Let the notation be as in §6.1, but to simplify things we will restrict to the case $n \geq 3$.

Assume that M is right flat over $\mathfrak{a}$. Let $U \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathfrak{a})$. A lift of U to $\mathfrak{a}_\eta$ is a pair (V, ϕ) where V is in $D_\infty(\mathfrak{a}_\eta)$ and ϕ is an isomorphism of graded $H^*(\mathfrak{a}_\eta)$-modules $H^*(V) \cong H^*(\mathfrak{a}_\eta) \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} U$.

Similarly, if M is left projective, then a colift of U to $\mathfrak{a}_\eta$ is a pair (V, ϕ), where V is in $D_\infty(\mathfrak{a}_\eta)$ and ϕ is an isomorphism of graded $H^*(\mathfrak{a}_\eta)$-modules $H^*(V) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{a}}(H^*(\mathfrak{a}_\eta), U)$.

We recall the following well-known fact.

Lemma 6.4.1. *The object $U \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathfrak{a})$ has a lift to $\mathfrak{a}_\eta$ if and only if $c_U(\bar{\eta}) = 0$. It has a colift if and only if $c_U^*(\bar{\eta}) = 0$.*

Proof. Both cases are similar, so we will consider the case of a lift. Thus in that case we assume that M is right flat. Let U' be the graded $H^*(\mathfrak{a}_\eta)$-module $U \oplus \Sigma^{n-2} M \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} U$. If V is an $\mathfrak{a}_\eta$-lifting of U then we may assume that V is represented by a "minimal model" object $V = (U', b_V)$ with $b_{V,1} = 0$. We now have a graded functor between graded categories

$$\mathfrak{a} \oplus \Sigma^{n-2} M \xrightarrow{f} \Lambda := \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{End}_k(U) & 0 \\ \mathrm{Hom}_k(U, \Sigma^{n-2} M \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} U) & \mathrm{End}_k(U) \end{pmatrix}$$

representing the action of $H^*(\mathfrak{a}_\eta)$ on U', and we have to change it to an A_∞-morphism

$$(\mathfrak{a} \oplus \Sigma^{n-2}M, b_{\mathfrak{a}_\eta}) \xrightarrow{f+\xi} \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{End}_k(U) & 0 \\ \mathrm{Hom}_k(U, \Sigma^{n-2}M \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} U) & \mathrm{End}_k(U) \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\xi : (\Sigma\mathfrak{a})^{\otimes n-1} \to \Sigma \,\mathrm{Hom}_k(U, \Sigma^{n-2}M \otimes_{\mathfrak{a}} U)$ and $b_{\mathfrak{a}_\eta} = b_{\mathfrak{a}} + \eta$. The required compatibility between cofunctors and codifferentials may be expressed as

$$(f + \xi) \circ (b_{\mathfrak{a}} + \eta) - b_\Lambda \circ (f + \xi) = 0,$$

with b_Λ being the codifferential on Λ. As usual we only have to check this after performing the projection $\mathbb{B}\Lambda \to \Lambda$. So the only possible non-trivial evaluation is on $\Sigma\mathfrak{a}^{\otimes n}$ and we get

$$\xi \circ b_{\mathfrak{a}} - b_\Lambda \circ \xi + f \circ \eta = 0,$$

which may be rewritten as

$$d_{\mathrm{Hoch}}(\xi) = f \circ \eta = c_U(\eta).$$

This proves what we want. □

7. Obstruction theory

7.1. **Preliminaries on A_n-categories and A_n-functors.** A_n categories and functors are defined by replacing $\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b}$ with the n-truncated $(\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b})_{\leq n}$ bar-cocategory. I.e. $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b})_{\leq n} = \mathrm{Ob}(\mathfrak{b})$ and

$$\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b}_{\leq n}(A, B) = \bigoplus_{i \leq n, A_1, \ldots, A_{i-1} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathfrak{b})} \Sigma\mathfrak{b}(A_{i-1}, B) \otimes \ldots \otimes \Sigma\mathfrak{b}(A, A_1)$$

As usual, we describe A_n-structures and morphisms via their Taylor coefficients, which may be evaluated on sequences of $i \leq n$ composable maps.

Given an A_n category $\mathfrak{b}$, we write $\mathfrak{b}_{\leq m}$ for the corresponding category viewed as an A_m-category for $m \leq n$. A similar convention applies to functors.

Like for the A_∞-case, all A_n-notions will be assumed to be strictly unital.

7.2. **Obstructions for A_∞-morphisms.** We will use [44, §10] as a convenient reference. The following lemma is a more precise version of [44, Lemma 10.3.1] (see [5] for a related result).

Lemma 7.2.1. *Let $f_i : \mathfrak{c} \to \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}$ be an A_i-functor between A_∞-categories. Then there is an "obstruction" $o_{i+1}(f_i) \in \mathrm{HH}^{i+1}(H^*(\mathfrak{c}), H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}))^{-i+1}$ with the following property: $o_{i+1}(f_i)$ vanishes if and only if there exists $\delta_i : (\Sigma\mathfrak{c})^{\otimes i} \to \Sigma\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}$ such that $b_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}},1} \circ \delta_i - \delta_i \circ b_{\mathfrak{c},1} = 0$ and such that $f_i + \delta_i$ extends to an A_{i+1}-functor. The obstruction $o_{i+1}(f_i)$ is natural in the following sense: for A_∞-functors $G : \mathfrak{c}' \to \mathfrak{c}$, $g : \tilde{\mathfrak{c}} \to \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}'$ we have*

$$o_{i+1}(g \circ f_i \circ G) = H^*(g) \circ o_{i+1}(f_i) \circ H^*(G). \tag{7.1}$$

Proof. First note that in [44] we worked with non-strictly unital A_∞-functors (in fact: morphisms). We may however equally well perform the construction in the strictly unital context by working with the normalized Hochschild complex. Here we will follow this approach.

We view f_i as a cofunctor $f_i : \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{c}_{\leq i+1} \to \mathbb{B}\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_{\leq i+1}$ by making its $i{+}1$'th Taylor coefficient zero. Define the f_i-coderivation $D : \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{c}_{\leq i+1} \to \mathbb{B}\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_{\leq i+1}$ as follows:

$$D = b_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}} \circ f_i - f_i \circ b_{\mathfrak{c}}\,.$$

It is clear that

$$b_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}} \circ D + D \circ b_{\mathfrak{c}} = 0. \tag{7.2}$$

Moreover, by construction we have that the Taylor coefficients D_n of D satisfy

$$D_n = 0 \qquad \text{for } n = 1, \dots, i \tag{7.3}$$

so that the only data in D is D_{i+1}, which by (7.2) descends to a linear map $\bar{D}_{i+1} : H^*(\Sigma\mathfrak{c})^{\otimes i+1} \to H^*(\Sigma\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$. As in the proof of [44, Lemma 10.3.1], from (7.2) one computes

$$0 = d_{\mathrm{Hoch}}(\bar{D}_{i+1}) \tag{7.4}$$

where d_{Hoch} represent the Hochschild differential. Computing degrees one sees that $\bar{D}_{i+1}$ represents an element of $\mathrm{HH}^{i+1}(H^*(\mathfrak{c}), H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}))^{-i+1}$, which we will call $o_{i+1}(f_i)$.

Furthermore - again as in the proof of [44, Lemma 10.3.1] - one sees that, if $o_{i+1}(f_i)$ vanishes, then f_i extends to f_{i+1} in the way described in the statement of the lemma.

To show that the implication goes in both directions, let us repeat the argument. The data f_{i+1}, δ_i as in the statement of the lemma will exist if and only the following equation has a solution in $(f_{i+1})_{i+1}$, δ_i:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (b_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}} \circ f_{i+1} - f_{i+1} \circ b_{\mathfrak{c}})_{i+1} \\ &= D_{i+1} + (b_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}} \circ (f_{i+1} - f_i) - (f_{i+1} - f_i) \circ b_{\mathfrak{c}})_{i+1} \\ &= D_{i+1} + b_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}},1} \circ (f_{i+1})_{i+1} - (f_{i+1})_{i+1} \circ b_{\mathfrak{c},1} \\ &\quad + b_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}},2} \circ (\delta_i \otimes f_1 + f_1 \otimes \delta_i) - \sum_{a+b+2=i+1} (\delta_i \circ (\mathrm{id}^{\otimes a} \otimes b_{\mathfrak{c},2} \otimes \mathrm{id}^{\otimes b}) \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

It is clear that this has a solution if and only if the corresponding equation in cohomology $0 = \bar{D}_{i+1} + d_{\mathrm{Hoch}}\bar{\delta}_i = 0$ has a solution, i.e. if and only the obstruction $o_{i+1}(f_i)$ vanishes.

Naturality: let us write $D(f_i)$ for D as introduced above. Then it follows from the definition (7.2) that for $f_i' = g \circ f_i \circ G$

$$D(f_i') = g \circ D(f_i) \circ G.$$

By (7.3) this yields

$$D(f_i')_{i+1} = g_0 \circ D(f_i)_{i+1} \circ G_0,$$

and passing to cohomology

$$\overline{D(f_i')}_{i+1} = \overline{g}_0 \circ \overline{D(f_i)}_{i+1} \circ \overline{G}_0$$

which is (7.1). □

If $f : H^*(\mathfrak{c}) \to H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$ is a graded functor, then it can always be completed to an A_2-functor $f_2 : \mathfrak{c} \to \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}$ (this is essentially choosing homotopies). So the first non-trivial obstruction is $o_3(f_2) \in \mathrm{HH}^3(H^*(\mathfrak{c}), H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}))^{-1}$. It is easy to see that it only depends on f. Indeed, two choices of f_2 only differ by a $\delta_2 : (\Sigma\mathfrak{c})^{\otimes 2} \to \Sigma\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}$ commuting with differentials, and this δ_2 disappears in the obstruction. See Corollary 7.2.4 for a variation on this fact.

In general, if we start from $f : H^*(\mathfrak{c}) \to H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$ we may compute obstructions

$$o_3(f_2), o_4(f_3), o_5(f_4), \dots$$

We will informally write these as

$$o_3(f), o_4(f), o_5(f), \dots$$

with the proviso that $o_{i+1}(f)$ only exists when $o_3(f), \dots, o_i(f)$ vanish, and furthermore $o_{i+1}(f)$ depends on prior choices. So it may be zero for one such choice and non-zero for another.

We will always apply Lemma 7.2.1 with $\mathfrak{c}$ being a k-linear category (i.e. concentrated in degree zero). In that case we have

$$o_i(f) \in \mathrm{HH}^i(\mathfrak{c}, H^{-i+2}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})). \tag{7.6}$$

Corollary 7.2.2. *Consider a commutative diagram of graded functors*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^*(\mathfrak{c}_1) & \xrightarrow{f_1} & H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_1) \\ {\scriptstyle H^*(G)}\uparrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H^*(g)} \\ H^*(\mathfrak{c}_2) & \xrightarrow[f_2]{} & H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_2) \end{array} \tag{7.7}$$

with g, G being A_∞-quasi-isomorphisms. Let $\{i_1, i_2\} = \{1, 2\}$. When making choices for computing the obstructions for f_{i_1}, we may make corresponding choices for computing the obstructions for f_{i_2} such that $o_*(f_2) = H^*(g) \circ o_*(f_1) \circ H^*(G)$.

Proof. When $i_1 = 1$, $i_2 = 2$ this is follows from naturality (see Lemma 7.2.1). For the case $i_1 = 2$, $i_2 = 1$ we use the fact that g, G have inverses up to homotopy in the A_∞-category. Such inverses are true inverses on cohomology. Now use again the naturality for A_∞-morphisms. □

Remark 7.2.3. It follows from Corollary 7.2.2 that in order to calculate obstructions for $f : \mathfrak{c} \to H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$ with $\mathfrak{c}$ a k-linear category we may replace $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}$ with a (strictly unital) minimal model $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$. By definition the underlying complex of $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$ is $H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$, with zero differential and there is an A_∞-quasi-isomorphism $g : \bar{\mathfrak{c}} \to \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}$ such that g_1 induces the identity on cohomology. Let $f_1 : \mathfrak{c} \to H^*(\bar{\mathfrak{c}})$ be such that $H^*(g_1) \circ f_1 = f$. By naturality we have $o_*^{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}}(f) = o_*^{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}}(H^*(g_1) \circ f_1) = H^*(g_1) \circ o_*^{\bar{\mathfrak{c}}}(f_1)$. How we use that $H^*(g_1)$ is the identity to obtain $o_*^{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}}(f) = o_*^{\bar{\mathfrak{c}}}(f_1)$.

Corollary 7.2.4. *Assume that $\mathfrak{c}$ is a k-linear category and let $f : \mathfrak{c} \to H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$ be a k-linear functor. If $-n < 0$ is maximal with the property that $H^{-n}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}) \neq 0$ then*

$$o_3(f) = \cdots = o_{n+1}(f) = 0 \tag{7.8}$$

and $o_{n+2}(f)$ does not depend on any choices.

Proof. Since by (7.6) $o_j(f) \in \mathrm{HH}^j(\mathfrak{c}, H^{-j+2}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}))$ we have $o_j(f) = 0$ for $-n+1 \leq -j+2 \leq -1$ which yields (7.8).

To prove the statement about $o_{n+2}(f)$ we may as in Remark 7.2.3 replace $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}$ with a minimal model $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$. But then $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}^{-n+1} = \cdots = \bar{\mathfrak{c}}^{-1} = 0$. Following the proof of Lemma 7.2.1, we have

$$f = f_1 = f_2 = f_3 = \cdots = f_n$$

To compute f_{n+1} we first have to compute

$$D(f_n)_{n+1} = (b_{\bar{\mathfrak{c}}} \circ f - f \circ b_{\mathfrak{c}})_{n+1}$$

If $n = 1$ then this is zero since f respects the multiplication. If $n > 1$ then using the fact that the lowest $b_{\bar{\mathfrak{c}},j}$ for $j > 2$ which can be non-zero is $b_{\bar{\mathfrak{c}},n+2}$ we also get zero which is compatible with the fact that we already know $o_{n+1}(f_n) = 0$.

To compute the possible lifts of f_n we have to solve (see (7.5))

$$0 = [d, (f_{n+1})_{n+1}] + d_{\mathrm{Hoch}}(\delta_n)$$

For degree reasons we must have $\delta_n = 0$. Since both $\mathfrak{c}$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$ have zero differential, it follows that we may choose $(f_{n+1})_{n+1} : (\Sigma\mathfrak{c})^{\otimes n+1} \to \Sigma(\mathfrak{c})^{-n}$ freely.

By definition $o_{n+2}(f)$ is the class of

$$(b_{\bar{\mathfrak{c}}} \circ f_{n+1} - f_{n+1} \circ b_{\mathfrak{c}})_{n+2} = b_{\bar{\mathfrak{c}},n+2} \circ (f \otimes \cdots \otimes f) + d_{\mathrm{Hoch}}((f_{n+1})_{n+1})$$

One easily checks that $b_{\bar{\mathfrak{c}},n+2}$ is a Hochschild cocycle, and moreover if we replace $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$ by another A_∞-isomorphic minimal model (see Remark 7.2.3) then $b_{\bar{\mathfrak{c}},n+2}$ changes only by a Hochschild boundary. From this we deduce that $o_{n+2}(f)$ is well defined. □

Remark 7.2.5. If we write $p_{n+2}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \bar{b}_{\bar{\mathfrak{c}},n+2} \in \mathrm{HH}^{n+2}(H^0(\mathfrak{c}), H^{-n}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}))$ then it was shown in the previous proof that $p_{n+2}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$ is well defined and moreover

$$o_{n+2}(f) = p_{n+2}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}) \circ f$$

Note that we may also think of $p_{n+2}(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$ as $o_{n+2}(j)$ where $j : H^0(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}) \to H^*(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}})$ is the inclusion.

If $\mathfrak{c}$ is a k-linear category, $\eta \in \mathrm{HH}^{n+2}(\mathfrak{c}, M)$ for $n \geq 1$ and $j : \mathfrak{c} \to H^*(\mathfrak{c}_\eta) = \mathfrak{c} \oplus \Sigma^i M$ is the inclusion then we obtain $o_3(j) = \cdots = o_{n+1}(j) = 0$ and $o_{n+2}(j) = \eta$.

We will use the following application.

Proposition 7.2.6. *Let $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{c}$ be k-linear categories, M an $\mathfrak{a}$-bimodule, $\eta \in \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathfrak{a}, M)$. Assume $f : \mathfrak{c} \to \mathfrak{a}$ is an additive functor such that $f_*(\eta) \overset{def}{=} \eta \circ f = 0$. Then there is a commutative diagram of A_∞-categories*

(7.9)



Proof. According to Corollary 7.2.4 and Remark 7.2.5 $f_*(\eta)$ is the single obstruction against the existence of the diagram (7.9). □

7.3. **Scalar extensions of derived categories.** Let Γ a k-algebra. For a k-linear category $\mathcal{A}$ we write $\mathcal{A}_\Gamma$ for the category Γ-objects in $\mathcal{A}$, i.e. pairs (M, ρ) where $M \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathcal{A}(M, M)$ is a k-algebra morphism.

There is a obvious forgetful functor

$$F : D(\mathfrak{b} \otimes_k \Gamma) \to D(\mathfrak{b})_\Gamma$$

There is a similar result as Lemma 7.2.1:

Lemma 7.3.1. (1) *Let $T \in D(\mathfrak{b})_\Gamma$. Then there is a sequence of obstructions*

$$o_{i+2}(T) \in \mathrm{HH}^{i+2}(\Gamma, \mathrm{Ext}^{-i}_{\mathfrak{b}}(T, T))$$

for $i \geq 1$ such that T lifts to an object in $D(\mathfrak{b} \otimes_k \Gamma)$ if and only if all obstructions vanish. More precisely $o_{i+1}(T)$ is only defined if $o_3(T), \ldots, o_i(T)$ vanish and it depends on choices.

(2) *If $f : \mathfrak{c} \to \mathfrak{b}$ is a DG-functor and $f_* : D(\mathfrak{b}) \to D(\mathfrak{c})$ is the corresponding change of rings functor then after having made choices for T we may make corresponding choices for $f_*(T)$ in such a way that*

$$f_*(o_{i+2}(T)) = o_{i+2}(f_*(T))$$

Proof. If T has a lift, then it is represented by a cofibrant object $\tilde{T}$ in $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(\mathfrak{b} \otimes_k \Gamma)$ for the standard projective model structure, which is in particular a cofibrant object in $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(\mathfrak{b})$ equipped with an A_∞-Γ-action. Conversely, an object in $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(\mathfrak{b})$ with an A_∞-Γ-action may be regarded as an object in $D(\mathfrak{b} \otimes_k \Gamma)$. See [44, Lemma 10.2.1] for an analogous statement which is proved in the same way.

Let $\tilde{T}$ be a cofibrant object in $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(\mathfrak{b})$ representing T. Put $\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{T}, \tilde{T})$. We have a graded k-algebra morphism $f : \Gamma \to H^*(\tilde{\Gamma})$, and the question is when can we lift it to an A_∞-morphism $\Gamma \to \tilde{\Gamma}$. This is controlled by the obstructions $o_i(T) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} o_i(f)$. We still have to show, however, that $o_i(T)$ is independent of the choice of $\tilde{T}$. Suppose that $\tilde{T}_1$, $\tilde{T}_2$ are cofibrant objects both representing T, i.e. that there is a quasi-isomorphism $u : \tilde{T}_1 \to \tilde{T}_2$ inducing the identity on T. Put $\tilde{\Gamma}_i = \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{T}_i)$ and let $f_i : \Gamma \to H^i(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)$ be the corresponding actions. Let $\tilde{\Gamma}$ be the sub-DG-algebra of $\mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathrm{cone}\, u)$ given by

$$\tilde{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Gamma}_1 & 0 \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\Sigma\tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2) & \tilde{\Gamma}_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We obtain a morphism of graded rings $f : \Gamma \to H^*(\tilde{\Gamma})$ given by

$$f = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 & 0 \\ 0 & f_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the projections $\tilde{\Gamma} \to \tilde{\Gamma}_1$, $\tilde{\Gamma} \to \tilde{\Gamma}_2$ are quasi-isomorphisms, and the resulting identification $H^*(\tilde{\Gamma}_1)$ and $H^*(\tilde{\Gamma}_2)$ is conjugation by $H^*(u)$, we conclude by Corollary 7.2.2 that the obstructions against lifting f, f_1 and f_2 all coincide, and those of f_1, f_2 are naturally identified. This finishes the proof that $o_i(T)$ is well defined.

The verification that the obstructions are natural is similar. Let $\tilde{T}_2 \to T$ be a cofibrant replacement of T in $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(\mathfrak{b})$ and let $u : \tilde{T}_1 \to f_*\tilde{T}_2$ be a cofibrant replacement of $f_*\tilde{T}_2$ in $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(\mathfrak{c})$. Put $\tilde{\Gamma}_1 = \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{c}}(\tilde{T}_1)$, $\tilde{\Gamma}_2 = \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\tilde{T}_2)$ and consider $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\Sigma\tilde{T}_1, f_*\tilde{T}_2)$ as $\tilde{\Gamma}_2 - \tilde{\Gamma}_1$-module. Put

$$\tilde{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Gamma}_1 & 0 \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{b}}(\Sigma\tilde{T}_1, f_*\tilde{T}_2) & \tilde{\Gamma}_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

with the differential being the sum of the natural one and the commutator with $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ u & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. We now have projection maps $p_i : H^*(\tilde{\Gamma}) \to H^*(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)$ with p_2 being a quasi-isomorphism. Moreover $H^*(p_1) \circ H^*(p_2)^{-1} : H^*(\tilde{\Gamma}_2) \to H^*(\tilde{\Gamma}_1)$ is the map $f_* : \mathrm{Ext}^*_{\mathfrak{b}}(T, T) \to \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathfrak{c}}(f_*T, f_*T)$ given by functoriality. The naturally of the obstructions now follows by applying Corollary 7.2.2. □

From Corollary 7.2.4 and the proof of Lemma 7.3.1 we also deduce:

Corollary 7.3.2. *Let $T \in D(\mathfrak{b})_\Gamma$. If $-n < 0$ is maximal with the property that $\mathrm{Ext}^{-n}_{\mathfrak{b}}(T, T) \neq 0$ then $o_3(T) = \cdots = o_{n+1}(T) = 0$, and $o_{n+2}(T)$ does not depend on any choices.*

8. Sheaves and presheaves

8.1. **Presheaves.** We discuss some notions introduced in [17, 30]. We follow more or less [30], but as we use left instead of right modules the conventions will be slightly different.

Let $(I, \leq)$ be a poset and let $\mathcal{O}$ be sheaf of k-algebras on I. For $j \leq i$, we denote the corresponding restriction morphism $\mathcal{O}(i) \to \mathcal{O}(j)$ by ρ_{ij}. In [30, §2.2] (following a similar construction in [17]) a k-linear category, which we will denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$, is associated to $\mathcal{O}$ as follows: $\mathrm{Ob}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}) = I$ and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(i,j) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(j) & \text{if } j \leq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The non-trivial compositions for $k \leq j \leq i$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(j,k) \otimes_k \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(i,j) \to \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(i,k)$$

are given by

$$\mathcal{O}(k) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(j) \xrightarrow{\text{restriction}} \mathcal{O}(k) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(k) \xrightarrow{\text{multiplication}} \mathcal{O}(k).$$

Let $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{O})$ be the category of presheaves of $\mathcal{O}$-modules. There is an equivalence of categories

$$\pi^* : \mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{O}) \to \mathrm{Mod}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}})$$

such that

$$\pi^*(M)(i) = M(i),$$

and the multiplication map for $j \leq i$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(i,j) \otimes_k (\pi^* M)(i) \to (\pi^* M)(j)$$

is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(j) \otimes_k M(i) \xrightarrow{\text{restriction}} \mathcal{O}(j) \otimes_k M(j) \xrightarrow{\text{action}} M(j). \tag{8.1}$$

Conversely, we may recover the restriction map $\rho_{ij} : M(i) \to M(j)$ as the action of the element $1_{\mathcal{O}(j)} \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(i,j)$.

Assume that $\mathcal{O}'$ is a second presheaf of rings on I. Write $\mathrm{Bimod}_k(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}') = \mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{O} \otimes_k \mathcal{O}'^{\circ})$. Then there is a functor (see [17][30, §3.4, Lemma 5.2])

$$\Pi^* : \mathrm{Bimod}_k(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}') \to \mathrm{Bimod}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}')$$

defined as follows

$$\Pi^*(M)(i,j) = \begin{cases} M(j) & \text{if } j \leq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The bimodule structure on $\Pi^*(M)(i,j)$ is defined using a similar formula as (8.1).

The functor Π^* is obviously exact and by [17][30, Thm 4.1, Lemma 5.2] the corresponding derived functor

$$\Pi^* : D(\mathrm{Bimod}_k(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}')) \to D(\mathrm{Bimod}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}'))$$

is fully faithful.

Lemma 8.1.1. *Let $U \in D(\mathcal{O}')$ and $M \in D(\mathrm{Bimod}_k(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}'))$. Then there is a natural isomorphism*

$$\pi^*(M \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}'} U) = \Pi^*(M) \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}'} \pi^* U \tag{8.2}$$

as objects in $D(\tilde{\mathcal{O}})$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the non-derived statement for U a projective object in $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{O}')$, as π^*U is then also projective in $\mathrm{Mod}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}')$ since π^* is an equivalence of categories. Equivalently, we may assume $U = \pi_* V$, with V a projective object in $\mathrm{Mod}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}')$ where $\pi_* = (\pi^*)^{-1}$. Furthermore, we may assume that V is of the form $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}'(i, -)$.

Then we find

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^*(M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}'} \pi_* \tilde{\mathcal{O}}'(i,-))(j) &= M(j) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}'(j)} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}'(i,j) \\ &= \begin{cases} M(j) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}'(j)} \mathcal{O}'(j) = M(j) & \text{if } j \leq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by the general property of tensor products

$$\Pi^*(M) \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}'} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}'(i,-) = \Pi^*(M)(i,-),$$

and hence, by the definition of $\Pi^*(-)$,

$$(\Pi^*(M) \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}'} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}'(i,-))(j) = \begin{cases} M(j) & \text{if } j \leq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In other words, for all i, j

$$\pi^*(M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}'} \pi_* \tilde{\mathcal{O}}'(i,-))(j) = (\Pi^*(M) \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}'} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}'(i,-))(j)$$

It remains to show that this identification is natural in i, j. This is a routine verification, which we omit. □

8.2. **Sheaves.** Here we recall some results from [29, §7.5ff]. Unless otherwise specified, in the rest of this section X will be a quasi-compact separated k-scheme. The separatedness hypothesis ensures that $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \cong D_{\mathrm{Qch}}(\mathrm{Mod}(X))$ [6]. Hence we will make no distinction between those two categories. Note, in particular, that $C(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$ has enough homotopically flat objects (see [1]), so the derived tensor product may be computed entirely on the quasi-coherent level.

Let $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i$ be an affine covering. For $I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ put $U_I = \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i$. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the poset $\{I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid I \neq \emptyset\}$, ordered in such a way that $I \leq J$ if $J \subset I$ (the strange ordering is motivated by the fact that $J \subset I$ implies $U_I \subset U_J$).

Let $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ be the presheaf of rings on $\mathcal{I}$ associated to $\mathcal{O}_X$, and, for a quasi-coherent sheaf M on X, let $\epsilon^* M$ be the corresponding presheaf of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$-modules. The corresponding derived functor

$$\epsilon^* : D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \to D(\mathrm{Mod}(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X))$$

has a right adjoint [29], which we will denote by $R\epsilon_*$. It may be computed using a version of the Čech complex. More precisely

$$R\epsilon_*(M) = \left(\bigoplus_{I \in \mathcal{I}} j_{U_I,*} \Sigma^{-|I|+1} \widetilde{M(I)}, d \right), \tag{8.3}$$

where $\tilde{?}$ is the quasi-coherent sheaf associated to a module over a commutative ring, and $j_{U_I} : U_I \to X$ is the inclusion map. The differential d is the usual alternating sum of restriction morphisms. Recall the following[4]:

Lemma 8.2.1. [29] *The functor $\epsilon^* : D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \to D(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X)$ is fully faithful and a left inverse is given by $R\epsilon_*$. Furthermore, the essential image of ϵ^* is $D_{\epsilon^* \mathrm{Qch}(X)}(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X)$.*

Below, if X is a quasi-compact separated scheme, we will denote by the corresponding curly letter $\mathcal{X}$ the category $\widetilde{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}}_X$, as introduced in this section and the previous one. There is now a fully faithful embedding

$$w : D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \to D(\mathcal{X}),$$

given by the composition

$$D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \xrightarrow{\epsilon^*} D(\mathrm{Mod}(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X)) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} D(\mathcal{X}).$$

We have a similar statement for bimodules. Let $D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$ be the category whose objects are the same as those of $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$, but whose Hom-sets are given by

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X))}(M, N) = \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qch}(X \times_k X))}(i_{\Delta,*}M, i_{\Delta,*}N),$$

where $i_\Delta : X \to X \times_k X$ is the diagonal. Let $Z = \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i \times_k U_i$. Note that $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Z = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X \otimes_k \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$. Then the map

$$D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \xrightarrow{M \mapsto i_{\Delta,*}M|Z} D(\mathrm{Qch}(Z))$$

is fully faithful, since the support of i_*M is closed in Z. By the above discussion, we obtain a fully faithful embedding

$$W : D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \to D(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \mathcal{X}^\circ)$$

given as the composition

$$D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \xrightarrow{M \mapsto i_*M|Z} D(\mathrm{Qch}(Z)) \xrightarrow{\epsilon^*} D(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X \otimes_k \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X) \xrightarrow{\Pi^*} D(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \mathcal{X}^\circ).$$

If M is a quasi-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-module, then following [45] its Hochschild cohomology is defined as

$$\mathrm{HH}^*(X, M) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Ext}^*_{X \times_k X}(i_{\Delta,*}\mathcal{O}_X, i_{\Delta,*}M).$$

Hence by the full faithfulness of W we have a canonical isomorphism [29]

$$\mathrm{HH}^*(X, M) \cong \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{X}, W(M)).$$

8.3. **Actions of bimodules on modules.** Consider the following bifunctor,

(8.4)

$$\mathcal{F} : D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \times D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \to D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) : (M, U) \mapsto R\,\mathrm{pr}_{1*}(i_{\Delta,*}M \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{X \times X}} \mathrm{pr}_2^* U)$$

Lemma 8.3.1. *The following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) & \times & D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle W} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w} \\ D(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \mathcal{X}^\circ) & \times & D(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow[-\overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{X}} -]{} & D(\mathcal{X}) \end{array}$$

[4]This is stated in somewhat greater generality than in loc. cit. However, it can be proved in the same way.

Proof. Let $\alpha, \beta : Z \to X$ be the first and the second projection respectively. Then we have

$$R\operatorname{pr}_{1*}(i_{\Delta,*}M \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{X\times X}} \operatorname{pr}_2^* U) = R\alpha_*(i_{\Delta,*}M|_Z \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \beta^* U).$$

So, by the definition of w and W, we have to prove that for $N = i_{\Delta,*}M \in D(\mathrm{Qch}(Z))$ there is an isomorphism

$$\pi^*\epsilon^*(R\alpha_*(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \beta^* U)) = \Pi^*\epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{X}} \pi^*\epsilon^* U,$$

which is natural in N considered as an object in $D(\mathrm{Qch}(Z))$.

It follows from (8.9) and Lemma 8.3.5 below that for any $N \in D(\mathrm{Qch}(Z))$ there is a canonical morphism

$$\epsilon^* R\alpha_*(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \beta^* U) \to \epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \epsilon^* U,$$

which is moreover an isomorphism if $N = i_{\Delta,*}M$.

Applying π^* and using Lemma 8.1.1 we get a canonical morphism

$$\pi^*\epsilon^* R\alpha_*(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \beta^* U) \to \Pi^*\epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{X}} \pi^*\epsilon^* U$$

having the same property. This finishes the proof. □

We now give the lemmas on which the previous proof was based.

Lemma 8.3.2. *Let $N, U \in D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$. Then*

$$\epsilon^*(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X} U) \cong \epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \epsilon^* U \tag{8.5}$$

Proof. We may assume that U is homotopically flat [1] and it easy to see that this implies that $\epsilon^* U$ is also homotopically flat. Hence we have to prove (8.5) for quasi-coherent sheaves, which is obvious. □

Lemma 8.3.3. *Let P be in $D(\mathrm{Qch}(Z))$. Then*

$$R\alpha_* P = R\epsilon_*^{\mathrm{left}}(\epsilon^* P), \tag{8.6}$$

where ϵ^{left} refers to the fact that we only consider the left $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$-structure on $\epsilon^* P$.

Proof. Since P is a complex of quasi-coherent sheaves P is quasi-isomorphic to its Čech complex. In other words it is isomorphic to

$$\left(\bigoplus_{I\in\mathcal{I}} j_{U_I\times_k U_I,*}\Sigma^{-|I|+1}P(U_I \times_k U_I)\tilde{}, d\right) \tag{8.7}$$

(8.7) consists of modules which are acyclic for α_*. In fact, $j_{U_I\times_k U_I}$ and $\alpha \circ j_{U_I\times_k U_I}$ are affine and hence have no higher direct images for quasi-coherent sheaves. It follows by the Leray spectral sequence that the same is true for α. Moreover, α_* has finite cohomological dimension. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} R\alpha_* P &= \left(\bigoplus_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \alpha_* j_{U_I\times_k U_I,*}\Sigma^{-|I|+1}P(U_I \times_k U_I)\tilde{}, d\right) \\ &= \left(\bigoplus_{I\in\mathcal{I}} j_{U_I*}\operatorname{pr}_{U_I\times_k U_I, U_I*}\Sigma^{-|I|+1}P(U_I \times_k U_I)\tilde{}, d\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\operatorname{pr}_{U_I\times_k U_I, U_I*}$ is the projection map. This is precisely $R\epsilon_*^{\mathrm{left}}$ applied to the presheaf on $\mathcal{I}$ given by $I \mapsto P(U_I \times_k U_I)$, and the latter is of course $\epsilon^* P$. □

Lemma 8.3.4. *Let N be in $D(\mathrm{Qch}(Z))$ and $U \in D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$. Then we have*

$$R\alpha_*(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \beta^* U) = R\epsilon_*(\epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \epsilon^* U) \tag{8.8}$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} R\alpha_*(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \beta^* U) &= R\epsilon_*^{\mathrm{left}}(\epsilon^*(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \beta^* U)) \\ &= R\epsilon_*(\epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Z} \epsilon^* \beta^* U) \\ &= R\epsilon_*(\epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Z} (\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Z \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \epsilon^* U)) \\ &= R\epsilon_*(\epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \epsilon^* U) \end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality we use (8.6), and in the second equality we use (8.5). □

By adjointness, we obtain from (8.8) a canonical morphism

$$\epsilon^* R\alpha_*(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \beta^* U) \xrightarrow{\cong} \epsilon^* R\epsilon_*(\epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \epsilon^* U) \xrightarrow{\text{counit}} \epsilon^* N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \epsilon^* U. \tag{8.9}$$

Lemma 8.3.5. (8.9) *is an isomorphism if N is of the form $i_{\Delta,*}M$.*

Proof. In that case, one easily checks that

$$\epsilon^* i_{\Delta,*} M \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \epsilon^* U = \epsilon^*(M \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X} U).$$

Since $M \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X} U$ is quasi-coherent, we obtain that the counit morphsim in (8.9) is an isomorphism. □

8.4. **Equivariant version.** Assume now that Γ is a k-algebra. Let $\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma$ be the category of quasi-coherent sheaves on X equipped with a left Γ-action. Let $\mathcal{X}_\Gamma = \mathcal{X} \otimes_k \Gamma$. Then, in a completely analogous way as above, we obtain a full faithful embedding

$$w : D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma) \to D(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma) \tag{8.10}$$

and furthermore a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) & \times & D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle W} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w} \\ D(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \mathcal{X}^\circ) & \times & D(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma) & \xrightarrow[-\overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{X}} -]{} & D(\mathcal{X}_\Gamma) \end{array}$$

8.5. **The characteristic morphism.** In §6.3 we introduced the characteristic morphism for DG-categories (following [26]). A similar definition works for schemes. We present a restricted version which is sufficient for our applications. Let X be as above and let $M, U \in D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$. Then the characteristic morphism

$$c_U : \mathrm{HH}^*(X, M) \to \mathrm{Ext}_X^*(U, M \overset{L}{\otimes}_X U)$$

is defined as follows. Let $\eta \in \mathrm{HH}^n(X, M)$, and view it as a map $\mathcal{O}_X \to \Sigma^n M$ in the category $D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$. Then

$$c_U(\eta) = \mathcal{F}(\eta, \mathrm{id}),$$

with $\mathcal{F}$ as in (8.4). From Lemma 8.3.1 we immediately obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{HH}^*(X,M) & \xrightarrow{c_U} & \mathrm{Ext}^*_X(U, M \overset{L}{\otimes}_X U) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle W} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w} \\ \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{X}, W(M)) & \xrightarrow[c_{w(U)}]{} & \mathrm{Ext}^*_{\mathcal{X}}(w(U), W(M) \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{X}} w(U)) \end{array} \tag{8.11}$$

If U is an object in $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma)$, then there is a characteristic map

$$c_{U,\Gamma} : \mathrm{HH}^*(X,M) \to \mathrm{Ext}^*_{\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma}(U, M \overset{L}{\otimes}_X U) \tag{8.12}$$

which fits in a similar commutative diagram as (8.11).

8.6. **Functoriality.** Now assume that X, Y are quasi-compact separated k-schemes, and let $f : X \to Y$ be a closed immersion. Let $Y = \bigcup_i^n V_i$ be an affine covering, and let $U_i = f^{-1}(V_i)$ be the induced covering on X.

The map f induces a dual functor

$$f : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$$

and hence a "change of rings" functor

$$f_* : D(\mathcal{X}) \to D(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Lemma 8.6.1. *The following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & D(\mathrm{Qch}(Y)) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle w} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w} \\ D(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow[f_*]{} & D(\mathcal{Y}) \end{array}$$

Proof. All functors are induced from exact functor on the level of abelian categories. Hence it suffices to check the commutativity on the level of sheaves, which is obvious. □

The functor $(f,f)_* : D(\mathrm{Qch}(X \times_k X)) \to D(\mathrm{Qch}(Y \times_k Y))$ descends to a functor

$$f_* : D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \to D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(Y)).$$

Lemma 8.6.2. *The following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(Y)) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle W} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle W} \\ D(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \mathcal{X}^\circ) & \xrightarrow[(f,f)_*]{} & D(\mathcal{Y} \otimes_k \mathcal{Y}^\circ) \end{array} \tag{8.13}$$

Proof. All functors are induced from exact functor on the level of abelian categories. Hence it suffices to check the commutativity on the level of sheaves, which is obvious. □

Applying (8.13) to morphisms $\mathcal{O}_X \to \Sigma^n M$ in $D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$, we get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X))(\mathcal{O}_X, \Sigma^n M) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(Y))(f_*\mathcal{O}_X, \Sigma^n f_* M) & \longrightarrow & D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(Y))(\mathcal{O}_Y, \Sigma^n f_* M) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle W}\cong & & \cong\downarrow{\scriptstyle W} & & \cong\downarrow{\scriptstyle W} \\ \mathrm{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{X}\otimes_k \mathcal{X}^\circ}(\mathcal{X}, W(M)) & \xrightarrow[(f,f)_*]{} & \mathrm{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{Y}\otimes_k \mathcal{Y}^\circ}(\mathcal{X}, W(M)) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{Y}\otimes_k \mathcal{Y}^\circ}(\mathcal{Y}, W(M)) \end{array}$$

where the rightmost square is obtained by precomposing with $\mathcal{O}_Y \to f_*\mathcal{O}_X$ and $\mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$ respectively.

We obtain a commutative diagram on the level of Hochschild cohomology

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{HH}^*(X, M) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \mathrm{HH}^*(Y, f_* M) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle W}\cong & & \cong\downarrow{\scriptstyle W} \\ \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{X}, W(M)) & \xrightarrow[f_*]{} & \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{Y}, W(M)) \end{array} \tag{8.14}$$

8.7. **Vector bundles and projectives.**

Lemma 8.7.1. (1) *Let M, N we quasi-coherent sheaves on X and put $\mathcal{M} = W(M)$, $\mathcal{N} = W(N)$. Then $W(M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} N) = \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{N}$.*

(2) *Assume that M is a vector bundle on X. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is projective on the left and on the right. That is, for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$ we have that $\mathcal{M}(I, -)$ and $\mathcal{M}(-, I)$ are respectively projective left and right $\mathcal{X}$-modules.*

Proof. (1) It is an immediate verification that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(I, -) &= \mathcal{X}(I, -) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_I)} M(U_I) \\ \mathcal{M}(-, I) &= M(U_I) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_I)} \mathcal{X}(-, I) \end{aligned} \tag{8.15}$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{N})(I_1, I_2) &= \mathcal{M}(-, I_2) \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{N}(I_1, -) \\ &= M(U_{I_2}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_2})} \mathcal{X}(-, I_2) \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{X}(I_1, -) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_1})} N(U_{I_1}) \\ &= M(U_{I_2}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_2})} \mathcal{X}(I_1, I_2) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_1})} N(U_{I_1}). \end{aligned}$$

Assume now $I_2 \subset I_1$ (for otherwise there is nothing to prove). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} M(U_{I_2}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_2})} \mathcal{X}(I_1, I_2) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_1})} N(U_{I_1}) &= M(U_{I_2}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_2})} \mathcal{O}_X(U_{I_2}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_1})} N(U_{I_1}) \\ &= M(U_{I_2}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(U_{I_2})} N(U_{I_2}) \\ &= (M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} N)(U_{I_2}) \\ &= W(M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} N)(I_1, I_2) \end{aligned}$$

(2) Now $M(U_I)$ is a projective $\mathcal{O}(U_I)$-module, and hence a summand of a free module. By (8.15) this implies that $\mathcal{M}(I, -)$ is a summand of $\mathcal{X}(I, -)^{\oplus n}$ for some n, and similarly for $\mathcal{M}(-, I)$. This means both are projective.

8.8. **Compact generators.** For a perfect complex P in $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$, put $P^D = \mathrm{R}\mathcal{H}om_X(P, \mathcal{O}_X)$. Recall the following

Lemma 8.8.1. *Let P be perfect object in $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$. Then P generates $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$ if and only if P^D generates $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$.*

Proof. By [36, 34] P generates $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$ if it classically generates the category $\mathrm{Perf}(X)$ of perfect complexes in $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$. The fact that $(-)^D$ is a duality on $\mathrm{Perf}(X)$ proves what we want. □

Proposition 8.8.2. *Let $T \in \mathrm{Qch}(X)$ be a tilting bundle, i.e. a vector bundle generating $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$ such that $\mathrm{Ext}^i_X(T,T) = 0$ for $i > 0$. Set $\Gamma = \mathrm{End}_X(T)$. Then*

$$c_{T,\Gamma} : \mathrm{HH}^*(X, M) \to \mathrm{Ext}^*_{\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma}(T, M \overset{L}{\otimes}_X T)$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. We claim that the functor

$$H : D(\mathrm{Qch}(X \times_k X)) \to D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma) : N \mapsto R\,\mathrm{pr}_{1*}(N \overset{L}{\otimes}_{X\times X} \mathrm{pr}_2^* T)$$

is an equivalence of categories. This implies what we want.

By Lemma 8.8.1 and [9, §3.4], $T \boxtimes T^D$ is a compact generator for $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X \times_k X))$ and it is also clear that $T \otimes_k \Gamma$ is a compact generator for $D(\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma)$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} H(T \boxtimes T^D) &= R\,\mathrm{pr}_{1*}((T \boxtimes T^D) \overset{L}{\otimes}_{X\times X} \mathrm{pr}_2^* T) \\ &= R\,\mathrm{pr}_{1*}(T \boxtimes \mathrm{R}\mathcal{H}om_X(T,T)) \\ &= T \otimes_k \Gamma \end{aligned}$$

and is clear that in this way H yields an isomorphism between

$$\mathrm{REnd}_{X\times_k X}(T \boxtimes T^D) = \Gamma \otimes_k \Gamma^\circ$$

and

$$\mathrm{REnd}_{\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma}(T \otimes_k \Gamma) = \Gamma \otimes_k \Gamma^\circ$$

This implies that H is an equivalence in the usual way. □

9. Some properties of divisors

9.1. **Preliminaries.** Let X be a quasi-compact separated scheme. If $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ are sheaves of k-algebras on X then an $\mathcal{A}-\mathcal{B}$-bimodule $\mathcal{F}$ is defined to be a sheaf of $\mathcal{A}\otimes_k \mathcal{B}^\circ$-modules. Note that even if $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ are quasi-coherent this will usually not be the case for $\mathcal{A}\otimes_k \mathcal{B}^\circ$. To compute things like $\mathcal{F} \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{B}} -$ we may take a flat resolution of $\mathcal{F}$ as sheaf of $\mathcal{A}\otimes_k \mathcal{B}^\circ$-modules. This is then automatically also a flat resolution as right $\mathcal{B}$-modules which can be used to compute the derived tensor product.

Define $D^\delta(\mathcal{O}_X)$ as the full subcategory of $D_{\mathrm{Qch}}(\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X)$ whose objects are objects are complexes of quasi-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules with $\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X$ acting via the multiplication map $\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X$. We will need the following lemma

Lemma 9.1.1. *There is an equivalence of categories*

$$D^\delta(\mathcal{O}_X) \cong D^\delta(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$$

which is the identity on objects.

Proof. As usual let $i_\Delta : X \to X \times X$ be the diagonal. Put $\mathcal{A} = i_\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X\times X})$. Then there is an obvious morphism of sheaves of algebras $\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{A}$ and we claim it is flat. Indeed it is easily seen that the stalk of $\mathcal{A}$ at $x \in X$ is equal to the localization of $\mathcal{O}_{X,x} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ at the kernel of the map $\mathcal{O}_{X,x} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X,x} \to k(x) \otimes k(x) \to k(x)$. Note that $\mathcal{A}$ also maps to $\mathcal{O}_X$, so we may define $D^\delta(\mathcal{A})$ as the full subcategory of $D(\mathcal{A})$ spanned by objects which are obtained from complexes of quasi-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules.

We have pairs of adjoint functors

$$D(\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X) \underset{-|\mathcal{O}_X\otimes\mathcal{O}_X}{\overset{\mathcal{A}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X\otimes\mathcal{O}_X} -}{\rightleftarrows}} D(\mathcal{A}) \underset{Ri_{\Delta,*}}{\overset{i_\Delta^{-1}}{\rightleftarrows}} D(\mathcal{O}_{X\times X}) \tag{9.1}$$

whose unit/counit maps are isomorphisms in the categories $D^\delta(-)$. From this it follows immediately that the functors in (9.1) define inverse equivalences between the $D^\delta(-)$. □

Corollary 9.1.2. *If $M \in D(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$ then*

$$\mathrm{HH}^*(X, M) = \mathrm{Ext}^*_{\mathcal{O}_X\otimes\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, M).$$

9.2. **The characteristic class of a divisor.** Unless otherwise specified, in the rest of this section X will be a closed subscheme of a quasi-compact separated k-scheme Y defined by an invertible ideal I. With a slight abuse of notation, we will write $\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_Y/I$ and we consider $\mathcal{O}_X$ as a sheaf of k-algebras on Y. We denote the inclusion $X \hookrightarrow Y$ by f.

We prove a technical result (Lemma 9.2.1 below) which will be used to show that certain Hochschild cohomology classes are non-trivial (see Proposition 9.3.1 below). The result is probably known in some form to experts. For example Andrei Căldăraru tells us that it would also follow from his work with Arinkin [2] on derived self-intersections, modulo some technical verifications. Nonetheless, since we were unable to find a written proof in the literature, we provide one here.

We consider the complex of $\mathcal{O}_X$-bimodules

$$C(X/Y) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_X$$

To compute the cohomology of $C(X/Y)$ we may view $C(X/Y)$ as a complex of $\mathcal{O}_Y - \mathcal{O}_Y$-bimodules. Using the obvious $\mathcal{O}_Y$-flat resolution of $\mathcal{O}_X$

$$0 \to I \to \mathcal{O}_Y \to \mathcal{O}_X \to 0,$$

we find

$$H^*(C(X/Y)) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_X & \text{if } i = 0 \\ I/I^2 & \text{if } i = -1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{9.2}$$

In particular, we have a distinguished triangle of $\mathcal{O}_X$-bimodules

$$C(X/Y) \to \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\xi_{X/Y}} \Sigma^2 I/I^2 \to \tag{9.3}$$

with $\xi_{X/Y} \in \mathrm{Ext}^2_{\mathcal{O}_X\otimes\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, I/I^2) = \mathrm{HH}^2(X, I/I^2)$, where we have used Corollary 9.1.2. By change of rings we have

$$\mathrm{HH}^2(X, I/I^2) = \mathrm{Ext}^2_{\mathcal{O}_X\otimes\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, I/I^2) = \mathrm{Ext}^2_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X\otimes\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X, I/I^2) \tag{9.4}$$

and if X, Y are smooth there is the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg isomorphism in the derived category of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules

$$\mathrm{HKR}_* : \mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{X\times X}} \mathcal{O}_X \to \wedge^\bullet \Omega_X \tag{9.5}$$

If we represent $\mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X$ by the usual Hochschild complex

$$\mathbf{C}_\bullet(X) := \cdots \to \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X,$$

then HKR_* is given by sending a local section $f_0 \otimes f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_n$ of $\mathcal{O}_X^{\otimes n+1}$ to $f_0 df_1 \cdots df_n$.

In particular combining (9.5) with (9.4) we get a split injective map

$$\mathrm{HKR} : \mathrm{Ext}^1_X(\Omega_X, I/I^2) \to \mathrm{HH}^2(X, I/I^2)$$

Lemma 9.2.1. *Assume that X, Y are smooth, and let $\xi'_{X/Y} \in \mathrm{Ext}^1_X(\Omega_X, I/I^2)$ correspond to the conormal sequence* [19, Prop. 8.4A]

$$0 \to I/I^2 \to \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \Omega_Y \to \Omega_X \to 0.$$

Then

$$\xi_{X/Y} = \mathrm{HKR}(\xi'_{X/Y}). \tag{9.6}$$

In particular, if $\xi'_{X/Y}$ is non-zero then so is $\xi_{X/Y}$.

Proof. To prove this lemma we have to understand better the distinguished triangle

$$\Sigma I/I^2 \to \mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X \to \tag{9.7}$$

corresponding to $\xi_{X/Y}$. We represent $\mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_X$ by the bar complex $B_\bullet(X/Y)$

$$\cdots \to \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_Y \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_Y \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_Y \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X$$

with the usual bar-differential. The analogous bar-complex $B_\bullet(X/X)$ is quasi-isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_X$ and the map $\mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X$ in (9.7) is represented by the map of complexes $B_\bullet(X/Y) \to B_\bullet(X/X)$. So we obtain an exact sequence of complexes of $\mathcal{O}_X$-bimodules

$$0 \to J_\bullet \to B_\bullet(X/Y) \to B_\bullet(X/X) \to 0 \tag{9.8}$$

where $J_\bullet$ is a complex concentrated in degrees ≤ -1 of the form

$$\cdots \to \mathcal{O}_X \otimes (I \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y + \mathcal{O}_Y \otimes I) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X \otimes I \otimes \mathcal{O}_X \to 0 \to 0$$

Now one computes locally that $H^{-1}(J^\bullet) = I/I^2$ and since $J^\bullet$ is acyclic in other degrees by (9.2) we obtain a quasi-isomorphism

$$J_\bullet \to \Sigma(I/I^2) \tag{9.9}$$

which sends local sections $f \otimes g \otimes h$ of J_1 to $f\bar{g}h$. Hence (9.8)(9.9) define a distinguished triangle *isomorphic* to (9.7). It takes some more straightforward verifications to show that the two distinguished triangles are actually the same, which we leave to the reader. If one does not want to do this then one may take (9.8)(9.9) as defining $\xi_{X/Y}$. It then differs from the prior definition by at most a global unit. Since we will be only interested in when $\xi_{X/Y} \neq 0$, this makes no difference.

Now we tensor (9.8) on the left by $\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} -$. Since all complexes in (9.8) are flat over $\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X$ this is in fact the derived tensor product. Furthermore one has obvious identifications of complexes of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules

$$\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} B_\bullet(X/Y) = \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} C_\bullet(Y)$$
$$\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} B_\bullet(X/X) = C_\bullet(X)$$

Moreover $\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} J_\bullet$ is a complex which ends with the the term $\mathcal{O}_X \otimes I$ in degree -1. We now immediately verify that we have a commutative diagram of complexes

(9.10)
$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} J_\bullet & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} C_\bullet(Y) & \longrightarrow & C_\bullet(X) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{can}} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{HKR}} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \Sigma(I/I^2) & \longrightarrow & \Sigma(\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \Omega_Y) & \longrightarrow & \Sigma\Omega_X & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

where the middle vertical map sends $f \otimes g \otimes h$ (in degree -1) to $f\bar{g}dh$. Then (9.10) give a map between distinguished triangles in the derived category of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules.
(9.11)
$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} \Sigma(I/I^2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} C(X/Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \xi_{X/Y}} & \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{can}} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{HKR}} & & \\ \Sigma(I/I^2) & \longrightarrow & \Sigma(\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \Omega_Y) & \longrightarrow & \Sigma\Omega_X & \xrightarrow[\Sigma\xi'_{X/Y}]{} & \end{array}$$

Completing (9.11) with a third commutative square we get

(9.12)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \otimes \xi_{X/Y}} & \Sigma^2(\mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X} I/I^2) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{HKR}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{can}} \\ \Sigma\Omega_X & \xrightarrow[\Sigma\xi'_{X/Y}]{} & \Sigma^2(I/I^2) \end{array}$$

Under the isomorphism (9.4), $\xi_{X/Y}$ corresponds to the diagonal composition $\mathrm{can} \circ (\xi_{X/Y} \otimes \mathrm{id})$, whereas $\mathrm{HKR}(\xi'_{X/Y})$ corresponds (by construction) to the other diagonal composition. Hence we are done. □

9.3. **A concrete example.** Here is a concrete example of a situation where $\xi_{X/Y} \neq 0$.

Proposition 9.3.1. *Let X be a smooth hypersurface of degree $d > 1$ in $Y = \mathbb{P}^n$, $n \geq 2$. Then $\xi_{X/Y} \neq 0$.*

Proof. According to [47], the conormal sequence on X is not split. The conclusion then follows from Lemma 9.2.1. □

9.4. **The long exact sequence associated with a divisor.** Recall the following:

Lemma 9.4.1. *Assume that M, N be complexes of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules. Then there is a long exact sequence*
(9.13)

$$\cdots \to \mathrm{Ext}^{n-2}_X(I/I^2 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} M, N) \xrightarrow{-\circ(\xi_{X/Y} \overset{L}{\otimes} \mathrm{id}_M)} \mathrm{Ext}^n_X(M, N) \xrightarrow{f_*} \mathrm{Ext}^n_Y(M, N) \to \cdots$$

Proof. Using change of rings we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ext}^n_Y(M,N) &= \mathrm{Ext}^n_X((\mathcal{O}_X \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_X) \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X} M, N)\\ &= \mathrm{Ext}^n_X(C(X/Y) \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X} M, N)\end{aligned}$$

From (9.3) we obtain a distinguished triangle

$$C(X/Y) \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X} M \to M \xrightarrow{\xi_{X/Y} \overset{L}{\otimes} \mathrm{id}_M} \Sigma^2(I/I^2 \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_X} M) \to$$

which yields the required long exact sequence by applying $\mathrm{Hom}_X(-,N)$. □

9.5. **Application to Hochschild cohomology.**

Proposition 9.5.1. *Let M be a complex of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules. There is a long exact sequence*

$$\cdots \to \mathrm{HH}^{n-2}(X, (I/I^2)^{-1} \otimes_X M) \xrightarrow{\xi_{X/Y}\otimes -} \mathrm{HH}^n(X,M) \xrightarrow{f_*} \mathrm{HH}^n(Y,M) \to \cdots$$

Proof. Let $\Gamma_f \subset Y \times_k X$ be the graph of f. The long exact sequence (9.13) applied to $X \times_k X \to Y \times_k X$ becomes (using the dictionary $X \mapsto X \times_k X$, $Y \mapsto Y \times_k X$, $I/I^2 \mapsto I/I^2 \boxtimes_k \mathcal{O}_X$, $M \mapsto \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_X}$, $f \mapsto (f, \mathrm{id})$, $N \mapsto i_{\Delta_X,*}M$)

(9.14)

$$\begin{aligned}\cdots \to \mathrm{Ext}^{n-2}_{X\times_k X}((I/I^2 \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_X) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X\times_k X}} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_X}, i_{\Delta_X,*}M) &\xrightarrow{-\circ((\xi_{X/Y}\boxtimes 1)\otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_X}})}\\ \mathrm{Ext}^n_{X\times_k X}(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_X}, i_{\Delta_X,*}M) &\xrightarrow{(f,\mathrm{id})_*} \mathrm{Ext}^n_{Y\times_k X}(\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_f}, (f,\mathrm{id}_X)_*M) \to \cdots\end{aligned}$$

Now $(I/I^2 \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_X) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X\times_k X}} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_X} = i_{\Delta_X,*}(I/I^2)$, and it is easy to see that with this identification we have $(\xi_{X/Y} \boxtimes 1) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_X}} = \xi_{X/Y}$.

We have

$$\mathrm{HH}^n(X,M) = \mathrm{Ext}^n_{X\times_k X}(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_X}, i_{\Delta_X,*}M)$$

If we consider M as $\mathcal{O}_{Y\times_k Y}$ module, then it is in fact supported on $X \times_k X$. Hence by adjointness

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{HH}^n(Y,M) &= \mathrm{Ext}^n_{Y\times_k Y}(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_Y}, i_{\Delta_Y,*}M)\\ &= \mathrm{Ext}^n_{Y\times_k X}((\mathrm{id}_Y, f)^*\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_Y}, (f,\mathrm{id}_X)_*M)\\ &= \mathrm{Ext}^n_{Y\times_k X}(\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_f}, (f,\mathrm{id}_X)_*M)\end{aligned}$$

Finally, since I/I^2 is an invertible $\mathcal{O}_X$-module, we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}^{n-2}_{X\times_k X}(i_{\Delta,*}(I/I^2), i_{\Delta_X,*}M) = \mathrm{HH}^{n-2}(X, (I/I^2)^{-1} \otimes_X M)$$

Substituting all this in (9.14) yields what we want. □

9.6. **The smooth proper case.** Here we assume that X, Y are both smooth proper connected of dimension m, $m+1$ respectively.

Lemma 9.6.1. *One has*

$$\mathrm{HH}^{2m}(X, \omega_X^{\otimes 2}) = k.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{HH}^{2m}(X,\omega_X^{\otimes 2}) &= \mathrm{Ext}^{2m}_{\mathcal{O}_{X\times X}}(\mathcal{O}_\Delta,\omega_\Delta^{\otimes 2})\\ &= \mathrm{Ext}^{2m}_{\mathcal{O}_{X\times X}}(\mathcal{O}_\Delta,\mathcal{O}_\Delta\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X\times X}}(\omega_X\boxtimes\omega_X))\\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X\times X}}(\mathcal{O}_\Delta,\mathcal{O}_\Delta)^*\\ &= k.\end{aligned}$$

In the third line we have used that $\omega_X\boxtimes\omega_X$ is the canonical sheaf on $X\times X$, together with Serre duality [7]. □

Lemma 9.6.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an invertible $\mathcal{O}_X$-module. The multiplication pairing*

$$\mathrm{HH}^i(X,\mathcal{L})\otimes\mathrm{HH}^{2m-i}(X,\mathcal{L}^{-1}\otimes_X\omega_X^{\otimes 2})\to\mathrm{HH}^{2m}(X,\omega_X^{\otimes 2})=k \tag{9.15}$$

is non-degenerate.

Proof. This again a straightforward application of Serre duality, which says that the following pairing by composition is non-degenerate

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i_{X\times X}(\mathcal{O}_\Delta,i_{\Delta,*}\mathcal{L})\otimes\mathrm{Ext}^{2m-i}_{X\times X}(i_{\Delta,*}\mathcal{L},\mathcal{O}_\Delta\otimes_{X\times X}(\omega_X\boxtimes\omega_X))\to\mathrm{Ext}^{2m}_{X\times X}(\mathcal{O}_\Delta,\mathcal{O}_\Delta\otimes_{X\times X}(\omega_X\boxtimes\omega_X))$$

It is easy to see that this pairing coincides with (9.15). □

Proposition 9.6.3. *Assume that $\xi_{X/Y}\neq 0$. Then*

$$f_*:\mathrm{HH}^{2m}(X,\omega_X^{\otimes 2})\to\mathrm{HH}^{2m}(Y,\omega_X^{\otimes 2})$$

is the zero map.

Proof. By Lemma 9.6.1 and Proposition 9.5.1, is it sufficient to show that the map

$$\mathrm{HH}^{n-2}(X,(I/I^2)^{-1}\otimes_X\omega_X^{\otimes 2})\xrightarrow{\xi_{X/Y}\otimes -}\mathrm{HH}^n(X,\omega_X^{\otimes 2})$$

is not zero. This follows from Lemma 9.6.2. □

10. Construction of potential non-Fourier-Mukai functors

We now assume that X/k, Y/k are smooth of dimension m, $m+1$, and that X is embedded as a divisor in Y. Let $f:X\to Y$ be the inclusion. Define $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ as in §8.2. We have a fully faithful embedding $w:\mathrm{Qch}(X)\to\mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{X})$ (see §8.2). Recall the following:

Lemma 10.1. (1) *If $E\in\mathrm{Qch}(X)$ is injective then so is wE.*
(2) *Every object in $\mathrm{Qch}(X)$ has injective dimension $\leq m$.*

Proof. (1) In this case, $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{X})$ is a locally noetherian category, so a direct sum of injectives in $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{X})$ is injective. Let $E\in\mathrm{Qch}(X)$ be injective. Since w commutes with direct sums, and since X is locally noetherian, we may without loss of generality assume that E is indecomposable, and hence of the form $\mathcal{H}^i_x(\mathcal{O}_X)$ for x a not necessarily closed point in X, see [18, Thm 7.18, proof]. Since $\mathcal{H}^i_x(\mathcal{O}_X)$ only depends on the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ we obtain that wE satisfies

$$(wE)(I)=\begin{cases}\Gamma(X,E) & x\in U_I\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}$$

Let I be the largest subset of $\{1,\dots,n\}$ such that $x \in U_I$. We find for $M \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{X})$:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}}(M, wI) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(U_I)}(M(I), \Gamma(X, E))$$

which is an exact functor.

(2) For each $U_i \subset X$ we have $\operatorname{gl\,dim} \mathcal{O}_X(U_i) = m$. It now suffices to note that on a noetherian scheme the propery of being quasi-coherent injective is local [18, Prop. 7.17].

Let M be a line bundle on X, and let $\mathcal{M} = W(M)$ be the corresponding $\mathcal{X}$-bimodule. By Lemma 8.7.1 we know that $\mathcal{M}$ is invertible. We will denote its two sided inverse by $\mathcal{M}^{-1}$.

Choose $n \geq m+3$ and let $\eta \in \ker(\mathrm{HH}^n(X, M) \to \mathrm{HH}^n(Y, M))$. See Lemma 9.6.1 and in particular Proposition 9.6.3 for how one may choose such η in the proper case.

For simplicity, denote the corresponding element $W(\eta) \in \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ by η as well. Define $\mathcal{X}_\eta$ as in §6.1. By (8.14), we have that $W(\eta) \in \ker(\mathrm{HH}^n(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \to \mathrm{HH}^n(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{M}))$. Hence, by Proposition 7.2.6, we have a commutative diagram



Put $\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}} = U^u(\mathcal{X}_\eta)$ (see Appendix C.1). Then we have

$$H^*(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{X} & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \mathcal{M} & \text{if } i = -n+2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{10.1}$$

We define the functor

$$L : \operatorname{Inj} \mathrm{Qch}(X) \to D(\mathcal{X}) : E \mapsto L(wE),$$

where $L(wE)$ is the derived injective in $D(\mathcal{X})$ associated to the injective wE.

Since $\mathrm{Qch}(X)$ has global dimension m, by Lemma 10.1(2) we are now in a position to apply Proposition 5.3.1 with $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Qch}(X)$, $\mathfrak{c} = \mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}$. This yields an exact functor

$$L : D^b(\mathrm{Qch}(X)) \to D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}). \tag{10.2}$$

Remark 10.2. We cannot apply Proposition 5.3.1 with $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{X})$, since if X is proper then it is easy to see that $\operatorname{gl\,dim} \mathcal{X} \geq 2m$.

Lemma 10.3. *If $B \in D^b(\mathrm{Qch}(X))$ is such that $\mathcal{B} = wB$, then there is a distinguished triangle in $D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}})$*

$$\mathcal{B} \to L(B) \to \Sigma^{-n+2}\mathcal{M}^{-1} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B} \to \tag{10.3}$$

where $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{M}^{-1} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B}$ are viewed as $\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}$-modules via the map

$$\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}} \to \mathcal{X}.$$

Proof. We have a distinguished triangle in $D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}} \otimes_k \mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg},\circ})$

$$\Sigma^{n-2}\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}} \to \mathcal{X} \to .$$

Applying $\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}}(-, L(B))$ and using (5.11) gives a distinguished triangle in $D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}})$

$$\mathcal{B} \to L(B) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}}(\Sigma^{n-2}\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}) \to .$$

It now suffices to observe that $\mathcal{M}$ is invertible.

Corollary 10.4. *If $B \in D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X))$ then $H^*(L(B)) \in D^b_{w\,\mathrm{coh}(X)}(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}})$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 10.3 and Lemma 8.3.1. □

The functor we would now want to consider is the composition

(10.4)

$$\Psi : D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \xrightarrow{L} D^b_{w\,\mathrm{coh}(X)}(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}) \xrightarrow{\psi_{\mathcal{X}_\eta,*}} D^b_{w\,\mathrm{coh}(X)}(\mathcal{X}_\eta) \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}_*} D^b_{w\,\mathrm{coh}(Y)}(\mathcal{Y}) \cong D^b(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$$

($\psi_{\mathcal{X}_\eta}$ is defined in §C.1, the last isomorphism is from Lemma 8.2.1).

We may compute the "virtual kernel cohomology" of Ψ.

Theorem 10.5. [42, Thm 1.1, proof] *(see also* [15]*) Let X, Y be smooth projective k-varieties and let $F : D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \to D^b(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$ be an exact functor. Choose an ample line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ on X, and let $\Gamma_*(X)$ be the corresponding homogeneous coordinate ring.*

Define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i = \bigoplus_i H^i(F(\mathcal{O}_X(n))).$$

Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i$ is a noetherian $\Gamma_*(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_Y$-module. Let $\mathcal{H}^i$ be the corresponding sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{X\times_k Y}$-modules.

If F is a Fourier-Mukai functor with kernel $\mathcal{K} \in D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X \times_k Y))$, then $H^i(\mathcal{K}) \cong \mathcal{H}^i$.

We apply this with $F = \Psi$. According to Lemma 10.3 we find

$$H^*(L(\mathcal{O}_X(n))) = w(\mathcal{O}_X(n) \oplus \Sigma^{-n+2}(M^{-1} \otimes_X \mathcal{O}_X(n))).$$

and since the last 3 morphisms in 10.4 are essentially the pushforward by f on the level of cohomology:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^* = f_*\mathcal{O}_X(n) \oplus \Sigma^{-n+2} f_*(M^{-1} \otimes_X \mathcal{O}_X(n)) \tag{10.5}$$

Let $i : X \to X \times_k Y$ be given by $i(x) = (x, f(x))$. From (10.5) we easily deduce

$$\mathcal{H}^* = i_*\mathcal{O}_X \oplus \Sigma^{-n+2} i_* M^{-1}. \tag{10.6}$$

11. Proof of Theorem 1.4

We remind the readers of the statement of the theorem:

Theorem 11.1. *Let X be a smooth quadric in $Y = \mathbb{P}^4$, and let $f : X \to Y$ be the inclusion. Let $M = \omega_X^{\otimes 2}$ and let $0 \neq \eta \in \mathrm{HH}^6(X, \omega_X^{\otimes 2}) \cong k$. Then $f_*\eta \in \mathrm{HH}^6(Y, f_*(\omega_X^{\otimes 2}))$ is zero. The functor Ψ in (1.7) restricts to an exact functor*

$$\Psi : D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \to D^b(\mathrm{coh}(Y))$$

which is not a Fourier-Mukai functor.

The fact that $\mathrm{HH}^6(X, M) = k$ is Lemma 9.6.1. The fact that $f_*(\eta) = 0$ follows from Proposition 9.6.3 using Proposition 9.3.1.

Let $\mathcal{O}_Y(1)$ be the tautological line bundle on $Y = \mathbb{P}^4$ and let $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ be its restriction to X. Then we have $\omega_X = \mathcal{O}_X(-3)$. If, as usual, I is the defining ideal of X in Y, then $I \cong \mathcal{O}_Y(-2)$ and hence $I/I^2 = \mathcal{O}_X(-2)$. Recall the following:

Theorem 11.2. [20] *There is a strong exceptional sequence on X given by*

$$\mathcal{O}_X(-2), \mathcal{O}_X(-1), \mathcal{O}_X, C \tag{11.1}$$

where C is associated to a matrix factorization of the defining equation of X in 4×4-matrices. In particular, it has a resolution on Y given by

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(-1)^4 \to \mathcal{O}_Y^4 \to C \to 0$$

If follows that all the objects occurring in the exceptional sequence (11.1) are arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay. Furthermore since odd dimensional quadrics have up to shift only a single non-trivial indecomposable Cohen-Macaulay module $\mathcal{C}$ (e.g. by Knörrer periodicity [22]), $\mathcal{C}$ must be its own syzygy up to shift. One finds that there is a short exact sequence on X

$$0 \to C(-1) \to \mathcal{O}_X^4 \to C \to 0. \tag{11.2}$$

Let T be the sum of the exceptional collection (11.1) and put $\Gamma = \mathrm{End}_X(T)$. Since Γ is given by a directed algebra with maximal compositions of length 3, we find

$$\mathrm{gl\,dim}\,\Gamma \leq 3. \tag{11.3}$$

For use below we record the following technical vanishing result. This and (11.3) are the only special properties of T we will use.

Lemma 11.3. *One has*

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i_X(T, (I/I^2)^{-1} \otimes_X M \otimes_X T) = 0$$

for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. We have $(I/I^2)^{-1} \otimes_X M = \mathcal{O}_X(-4)$. By Serre duality

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i_X(T, T(-4)) = \mathrm{Ext}^{3-i}_X(T, T(1))^*$$

Since T is arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay, we have

$$H^i(X, T(j)) = 0$$

for all j and $i = 1, 2$. Hence by Serre duality

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i_X(T, \mathcal{O}_X(j)) = 0$$

for all j and $i = 1, 2$.

So the only possible issue is the value of

$$\mathrm{Ext}^i_X(C, C(1))$$

for $i = 1, 2$. From (a shift by 1 of) the exact sequence (11.2) we get

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_X(C, C(1)) = \mathrm{Ext}^2_X(C, C) = 0$$

since C is exceptional. Similarly

$$\mathrm{Ext}^2_X(C, C(1)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^3_X(C, C) = 0. \quad \square$$

Consider first the functor (see (10.2) and Corollary 10.4)

$$L : D^b(\mathrm{coh}(X)) \to D^b_{w\,\mathrm{coh}(X)}(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}})$$

Put $\mathcal{T} = wT$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = L(\mathcal{T})$. Since Γ acts on T it also acts on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ and hence $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \in D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}})_\Gamma$. According to Lemma 7.3.1 and Corollary 7.3.2, there is a well defined obstruction

$$o_3(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}) \in \mathrm{HH}^3(\Gamma, \mathrm{Ext}^{-1}_{\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}))$$

which vanishes if $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is in the essential image of

$$D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}} \otimes_k \Gamma) \to D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}})_\Gamma$$

Lemma 11.4. *One has*

$$o_3(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}) \neq 0$$

Proof. If $o_3(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})$ were to vanish, then the higher obstructions $o_{3+i}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})$ (Lemma 7.3.1), which lie in $\mathrm{HH}^{3+i}(\Gamma, \mathrm{Ext}^{-1-i}_{\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}))$, would also vanish, since $\mathrm{gl\,dim}\,\Gamma = 3$ and hence the Hochschild dimension of Γ is 3 as well. So $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ may be viewed as an object in $D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}} \otimes_k \Gamma) \cong D_\infty(\mathcal{X}_\eta \otimes_k \Gamma)$. By (10.3) we get a distinguished triangle in $D(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}})$

$$\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \xrightarrow{\beta} \Sigma^{-4}\mathcal{M}^{-1} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{T} \to \tag{11.4}$$

and hence

$$H^*(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}) = \mathcal{T} \oplus \Sigma^{-4}(\mathcal{M}^{-1} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{T}),$$

and moreover, by construction, this isomorphism is compatible with the $H^*(\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}) = H^*(\mathcal{X}_\eta)$ and Γ-actions. In the terminology of §6.4, $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is a colift of $\mathcal{T} \in D(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \Gamma)$ to $D_\infty((\mathcal{X}_\eta \otimes_k \Gamma)_{\eta \cup 1})$ (see §6.2).

The obstruction against the existence of such a colift is the image of $\eta \cup 1$ under the characteristic map

$$\mathrm{HH}^6(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \Gamma, \mathcal{M} \otimes_k \Gamma) \xrightarrow{c_{\mathcal{T}}} \mathrm{Ext}^6_{\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \Gamma}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{T})$$

(see Lemma 6.4.1, Lemma 6.3.1 and §6.2). Now the composition

$$\mathrm{HH}^6(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) \xrightarrow{\eta \mapsto \eta \cup 1} \mathrm{HH}^6(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \Gamma, \mathcal{M} \otimes_k \Gamma) \xrightarrow{c_{\mathcal{T}}} \mathrm{Ext}^6_{\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \Gamma}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{T})$$

is precisely the Γ-equivariant characteristic map $c_{\mathcal{T},\Gamma}$ introduced in (8.12). By the Γ equivariant version of (8.11) we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{HH}^6(X, M) & \xrightarrow{c_{T,\Gamma}} & \mathrm{Ext}^6_{\mathrm{Qch}(X)_\Gamma}(T, M \overset{L}{\otimes}_X T) \\ {\scriptstyle W}\downarrow & & \cong\downarrow{\scriptstyle w} \\ \mathrm{HH}^6(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}) & \xrightarrow[c_{\mathcal{T},\Gamma}]{} & \mathrm{Ext}^6_{\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \Gamma}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M} \overset{L}{\otimes}_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{T}) \end{array}$$

The rightmost map is an isomorphism by (8.10) and, by Proposition 8.8.2, the upper horizontal map is also an isomorphism, finishing the proof. □

Applying $\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}}(-, \tilde{\mathcal{T}})$ to (11.4), and using (5.11), we get a distinguished triangle of complexes

$$\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{X}}(\Sigma^{-4}\mathcal{M}^{-1} \otimes_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}) \to \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}) \to \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}) \to$$

and hence

$$\mathrm{Ext}^3_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{M}^{-1}\otimes_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T})\cong \mathrm{Ext}^{-1}_{\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}},\tilde{\mathcal{T}}) \tag{11.5}$$

For use below, we note that this isomorphism sends a morphism $\phi:\mathcal{M}^{-1}\otimes_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{T}\to\mathcal{T}$ of degree three to the composition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}\xrightarrow{\beta}\Sigma^{-4}\mathcal{M}^{-1}\otimes_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{T}\xrightarrow{\phi}\Sigma^{-1}\mathcal{T}\xrightarrow{\Sigma^{-1}\alpha}\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}. \tag{11.6}$$

Lemma 11.5. *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\mathrm{Ext}^3_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{M}^{-1}\otimes_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathrm{Ext}^{-1}_{\mathcal{X}_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}},\tilde{\mathcal{T}})\\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_*} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \tilde{f}_*\circ\psi_{\mathcal{X}_\eta,*}}\\ \mathrm{Ext}^3_{\mathcal{Y}}(f_*(\mathcal{M}^{-1}\otimes_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{T}),f_*(\mathcal{T})) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Ext}^{-1}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\tilde{f}_*(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}),\tilde{f}_*(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}))\end{array} \tag{11.7}$$

where the upper map is as in (11.5) *and the lower map is defined in a similar way as* (11.6).

Proof. This is a tautology starting from (11.6). □

Corollary 11.6. *The map $\tilde{f}_*\circ\psi_{\mathcal{X}_\eta,*}$ in* (11.7) *is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Note that, since $\dim Y=4$,

$$\tilde{f}_*(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})=f_*(\mathcal{T})\oplus f_*(\Sigma^{-4}\mathcal{M}^{-1}\otimes_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{T}),$$

from which it follows right away that the lower arrow on (11.7) is an isomorphism. So it suffices to show that the left arrow is an isomorphism. Using Lemma 8.6.1, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^3_X(M^{-1}\otimes_X T,T)\xrightarrow{f_*}\mathrm{Ext}^3_Y(f_*(M^{-1}\otimes_X T),f_*(T))$$

is an isomorphism. We have a long exact sequence (see (9.13))

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ext}^1_X(T,(I/I^2)^{-1}\otimes_X M\otimes_X T))\to\mathrm{Ext}^3_X(T,M\otimes_X T)\xrightarrow{f_*}\\ \mathrm{Ext}^3_Y(f_*(T),f_*(M\otimes_X T))\to\mathrm{Ext}^2_X(T,(I/I^2)^{-1}\otimes_X M\otimes_X T)).\end{aligned}$$

Now by Lemma 11.3 we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_X(T,(I/I^2)^{-1}\otimes_X M\otimes_X T)=\mathrm{Ext}^2_X(T,(I/I^2)^{-1}\otimes_X M\otimes_X T)=0,$$

so that we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}^3_X(M^{-1}\otimes_X T,T)\xrightarrow[\cong]{f_*}\mathrm{Ext}^3_X(f_*(M^{-1}\otimes_X T),f_*T)$$

and we are done. □

Since Ψ is a functor, we obviously have

$$\Psi(T)=(\tilde{f}_*\circ\psi_{\mathcal{X}_\eta,*})(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})\in D(\mathcal{Y})_\Gamma.$$

If Ψ is Fourier-Mukai then $\Psi(T)\in D(\mathcal{Y}\otimes_k\Gamma)$.

Lemma 11.7. *The obstruction (see Lemma 7.3.1)*

$$o_3(\Psi(T))\in \mathrm{HH}^3(\Gamma,\mathrm{Ext}^{-1}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\Psi(T),\Psi(T))$$

is not vanishing.

Proof. By the naturality of obstructions (see Lemma 7.3.1), we have

$$o_3(\Psi(T)) = (\tilde{f}_* \circ \psi_{\mathcal{X}_\eta,*})(o_3(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})).$$

By Corollary 11.6 we know that $\tilde{f}_* \circ \psi_{\mathcal{X}_\eta,*}$ is an isomorphism and by Lemma 11.4 we have $o_3(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}) \neq 0$. □

Done!

Appendix A. Construction of L using A_n-functors

Unless otherwise specified we use the notation and conventions introduced in §4.

A.1. **Introduction.** The language of A_n-functors allows us to construct an explicit functor

$$L' : H^0(C(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})^f_{\mathrm{can}}) \to H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$$

(see Proposition A.4.3 below), hence it gives an alternative construction of a functor $D^b(\mathcal{A}) \to H^0(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})$ as $H^0(\omega)\circ L'\circ H^0(\omega)^{-1}$ instead of $H^0(\omega)\circ H^0(G^f)^{-1}\circ H^0(\omega)^{-1}$ (see §4.3.3 for notation). However, it does not seem to yield and easy proof that the resulting functor is exact.

Since we also show that L' is a right inverse to $H^0(G^f)$, the two approaches yield in fact the same functor $D^b(\mathcal{A}) \to H^0(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})$.

A.2. **Preliminaries on twisting A_∞-categories and functors.** Let us say that an A_∞-category $\mathfrak{a}$ is compact if $b_{\mathfrak{a},n} = 0$ for $n \gg 0$. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a compact A_∞-category. For $A \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathfrak{a})$ put

$$\operatorname{MC}(A) = \{\delta \in \mathfrak{a}(A,A)^1 \mid \sum_n b_{\mathfrak{a},n}(s\delta,\dots,s\delta) = 0\}$$

We refer to the elements of $\operatorname{MC}(A)$ as "Maurer-Cartan elements". We define $\operatorname{tw}\mathfrak{a}$ as the compact A_∞-category with

$$\operatorname{Ob}(\operatorname{tw}\mathfrak{a}) = \{(A,\delta) \mid A \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathfrak{a}), \delta \in \operatorname{MC}(A)\}$$
$$(\operatorname{tw}\mathfrak{a})((A,\delta),(A',\delta')) = \mathfrak{a}(A,A')$$

and higher operations for composable arrows

$$(A_0,\delta_0) \xrightarrow{u_1} (A_1,\delta_1) \xrightarrow{u_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{u_p} (A_p,\delta_p)$$

given by

$$b_{\operatorname{tw}\mathfrak{a},p}(su_p,\dots,su_1) = \sum_{m=p+\sum_{i=0}^p n_i} b_{\mathfrak{a},m}(\underbrace{s\delta_p,\dots,s\delta_p}_{n_p}, su_p, \underbrace{s\delta_{p-1},\dots,s\delta_{p-1}}_{n_{p-1}}, su_{p-1},\dots,su_1, \underbrace{s\delta_0,\dots,s\delta_0}_{n_0})$$

Remark A.2.1. Note that, if $\mathfrak{a}$ is a DG-category, then the Maurer-Cartan elements must satisfy

$$d\delta + \delta^2 = 0$$

and furthermore it is easy to see that $\operatorname{tw}\mathfrak{a}$ is also a DG-category.

Remark A.2.2. The restriction $\delta_i \in \operatorname{MC}(A_i)$ is to make sure that $\operatorname{tw}\mathfrak{a}$ is an actual A_∞-category instead of only a cA_∞-category (concretely: to have $b_{\operatorname{tw}\mathfrak{a},0} = 0$). See e.g. [16].

We will say that an A_∞-functor $f : \mathfrak{a} \to \mathfrak{b}$ (or below: an arbitrary cofunctor $f : \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a} \to \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b}$) is proper if $f_n = 0$ for $n \gg 0$. Then we have the following folklore result

Proposition A.2.3. *Let $f : \mathfrak{a} \to \mathfrak{b}$ be a proper A_∞-functor between compact A_∞-categories.*

(1) *For $A \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathfrak{a})$ and $B = f(A)$ there is a well defined map*

$$\mathrm{MC}(f) : \mathrm{MC}(A) \to \mathrm{MC}(B) : \delta \mapsto \sum_n s^{-1} f_n(s\delta, \dots, s\delta)$$

(2) *There is an A_∞ functor $\operatorname{tw} f : \operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{a} \to \operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{b}$ defined as follows*
   (a) *On objects:* $(\operatorname{tw} f)(A, \delta) = (f(A), \mathrm{MC}(f)(\delta))$.
   (b) *For composable arrows:*

$$(A_0, \delta_0) \xrightarrow{u_1} (A_1, \delta_1) \xrightarrow{u_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{u_p} (A_p, \delta_p)$$

$$(\operatorname{tw} f)_p(su_p, \dots, su_1) = \sum_{m=p+\sum_{i=0}^p n_i} f_m(\underbrace{s\delta_p, \dots, s\delta_p}_{n_p}, su_p, \underbrace{s\delta_{p-1}, \dots, s\delta_{p-1}}_{n_{p-1}}, su_{p-1}, \dots, su_1, \underbrace{s\delta_0, \dots, s\delta_0}_{n_0})$$

Now assume that $f : \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a} \to \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b}$ is only a cofunctor. We are interested in when $\operatorname{tw} f$ defines a functor $H^0(\operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{a}) \to H^0(\operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{b})$. A moment's reflection shows that the answer is given by the following proposition:

Proposition A.2.4. *Let $f : \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a} \to \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b}$ be a proper cofunctor between compact A_∞-categories $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$. Then $\operatorname{tw} f$ defines a functor $H^0(\operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{a}) \to H^0(\operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{b})$ if ($pr_{\mathfrak{b}} : \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{b}$ being the obvious projection)*

$$pr_{\mathfrak{b}} \circ (f \circ b_{\mathfrak{a}} - b_{\mathfrak{b}} \circ f)$$

vanishes when evaluated on the following types of sequences of composable arrows:

$$(s\delta_0, \dots, s\delta_0) \tag{A.1}$$

$$(s\delta_1, \dots, s\delta_1, su_1, s\delta_0, \dots, s\delta_0) \qquad |u_1| = 0, -1 \tag{A.2}$$

$$(s\delta_2, \dots, s\delta_2, su_2, s\delta_1, \dots, s\delta_1, su_1, s\delta_0, \dots, s\delta_0) \qquad |u_2| = |u_1| = 0 \tag{A.3}$$

where the δ_i are Maurer-Cartan elements.

Proof. Vanishing on (A.1) ensures that $\mathrm{MC}(f)(\delta_0)$ is again a Maurer-Cartan element. Vanishing on (A.2) ensures that $(\operatorname{tw} f)_1$ commutes with differentials in degrees $-1, 0$ so that we obtain a well defined induced linear map $H^0((\operatorname{tw} f)_1) : H^0(\operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{a}) \to H^0(\operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{b})$ and vanishing of (A.3) ensures compatibility of $(\operatorname{tw} f)_1$ with the composition of two morphisms of degree zero in $\operatorname{tw} \mathfrak{a}$. □

Convention A.2.5. *If $f : \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a} \to \mathbb{B}\mathfrak{b}$ is a cofunctor, then we will informally refer to it as a cofunctor $f : \mathfrak{a} \to \mathfrak{b}$.*

A.3. **First extension.** We now revert to the notation which was in use in §4.1

Lemma A.3.1. *L lifts to an A_{m+2}-functor $\tilde{L} : \operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{A} \to \mathfrak{b}$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 7.2.1, we have to show that the obstructions $o_3(f), \dots, o_{m+2}(f)$ vanish. These obstructions are in $\mathrm{HH}^{i+2}(\operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{A}, H^{-i}(\mathfrak{b}(L(-), L(-))))$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, so they vanish on the nose by (4.1). □

In the sequel will extend $\tilde{L}$ to a proper cofunctor $\operatorname{Inj} \mathcal{A} \to \mathfrak{b}$ by setting $\tilde{L}_i = 0$ for $i > m + 2$.

A.4. **Further extending.**

Definition A.4.1. For an A_∞-category $\mathfrak{b}$, define the category $\operatorname{Filt}\mathfrak{b}$ as follows:

- Objects are finite formal sums $(A)_{in} := \bigoplus_{i,n} \Sigma^i A_{i,n}$, where $A_{i,n} \in \mathfrak{b}$ and Σ is a formal shift
- Morphisms are given by

$$\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})((A)_{i,m},(B)_{j,n})^k = \bigoplus_{i,j,n\geq m} \mathfrak{b}(A_{i,n},B_{j,m})^{j-i+k}$$

It is easy to see that $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})$ is also an A_∞-category which in addition has finite direct sums. For use below we introduce the full subcategory $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})^1$ of $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})$ which consists of formal sums having only a single term.

Recall our definition of the DG-category $(C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))^f$. Objects are pairs (J,δ_J), where J is a finite formal sum $J = \oplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} J_i$ with $(J_i)_i \in \operatorname{Ob}(C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A})))$, and $\delta_J \in C(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})(J,J)^1$ is such that $d(\delta_J)+\delta_J^2 = 0$.

There is a fully faithful DG-functor (cfr. Remark A.2.1)

$$(C(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}))^f \xrightarrow{\varphi} \operatorname{tw}(\operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}))$$

$$(J=\oplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}(J_i),\delta_J) \mapsto \begin{cases} \varphi(J) = \oplus_{i,m}\Sigma^m(J_i)_m \\ \delta_{\varphi_J} = d+\delta_J \end{cases}$$

where $J_i \in C(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})$ so that $J_i = \ldots (J_i)_{m-1} \xrightarrow{d} (J_i)_m \xrightarrow{d} (J_i)_{m+1} \to \ldots$.

There is a similar fully faithful functor

$$(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f \xrightarrow{\psi} \operatorname{tw}(\operatorname{Filt}\mathfrak{b})$$

$$(B=\oplus_i(B_i,\delta_{B_i}),\delta_B) \mapsto \begin{cases} \psi(B) = \oplus_{i,m}\Sigma^m(B_{im}) \\ \delta_{\psi(B)} = \delta_{B_i}+\delta_B \end{cases}$$

in the same way as φ before, where $(B_i,\delta_{B_i}) \in \operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b}$ so $B_i = (B_{im})_m$.

For use below, define the full DG-subcategory $C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))^{f0}_{\text{can}}$ of $C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))^f_{\text{can}}$ by restricting each J_i to be a complex of length m (i.e. m arrows) starting in degree i and ending in degree $i+m$.

Lemma A.4.2. *The obvious functor*

$$H^0(C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))^{f0}_{\text{can}}) \xrightarrow{\text{Tot}} H^0(C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))) \cong D^b(\mathcal{A})$$

is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. This is proved in the same way as (4.10). □

Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the essential image of $(C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))^{f0}_{\text{can}}$ in $\operatorname{tw}\operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}))$. Objects in $\mathcal{D}$ look as follow:

(A.4)



where each $\times \in \operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}$ and there are precisely $m+1$ crosses per row. The arrows represent the Maurer-Cartan element.

Let $\mathcal{D}^0$ be the full subcategory of $\operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})$ consisting of $(A)_{in} = \bigoplus_{i,n} \Sigma^i A_{i,n}$ which have no components at locations in the diagram which are not decorated by a cross. Here $\Sigma^i A_{i,n}$ has horizontal coordinate $-i$ and vertical coordinate n. We now have inclusions of DG-categories

$$C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))^{f0}_{\mathrm{can}} \cong \mathcal{D} \subset \operatorname{tw}\mathcal{D}^0 \subset \operatorname{tw}\operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}).$$

Let

$$\tilde{L} : \operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}) \to \operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})$$

be the cofunctor obtained by linearly extending the A_{m+2}-functor constructed in Lemma A.3.1. Then the following holds:

Proposition A.4.3. (1) $\operatorname{tw}\tilde{L} : \operatorname{tw}\operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A}) \to \operatorname{tw}\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})$ *as defined in §A.2 restricts to an additive functor*

$$H^0(\operatorname{tw}\tilde{L}) : H^0(\operatorname{tw}\mathcal{D}^0) \to H^0(\operatorname{tw}\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b}))$$

(2) *The functor $H^0(\operatorname{tw}\tilde{L})$ fits in a commutative diagram*

(A.5)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))^{f0}_{\mathrm{can}}) & \xrightarrow{L'} & H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}}) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle H^0(\varphi)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H^0(\psi)} \\ H^0(\operatorname{tw}\mathcal{D}^0) & \xrightarrow[H^0(\operatorname{tw}\tilde{L})]{} & H^0(\operatorname{tw}\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})) \end{array}$$

(3) *One has that $H^0(G^f) \circ L'$ is the identity.*

Proof. (1) We need to check the hypotheses for Proposition A.2.4. Since $\tilde{L}$, $\mathfrak{b}_{\operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})}$ are obtained by linear extension from the corresponding operations on $\operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})^1$, $\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})^1$ it follows that we have to show that $\tilde{L} \circ b_{\operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})^1} - b_{\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b})^1} \circ \tilde{L}$ vanishes when evaluated on a sequence of composable arrows $sv_t, \ldots, sv_1$ in $\mathcal{D}^0 \cap \operatorname{Filt}(\operatorname{Inj}\mathcal{A})^1$ which all have degree one except for at most two which have degree zero or one is of degree -1. Now it is clear by inspecting the diagram (A.4) that the maximal such sequence has length $m+2$. Since $\tilde{L}$ is an A_{m+2}-functor we are done.

(2) If we compute $Y = (H^0(\operatorname{tw}\tilde{L}) \circ H^0(\varphi))(X)$ then we see that the "rows" of $Y \in H^0(\operatorname{tw}\operatorname{Filt}(\mathfrak{b}))$ only depend on the corresponding rows of X. If a row of X is a (shifted) injective resolution of $A \in \mathcal{A}$, then we also see that the corresponding row in Y is a shifted object of the form $L(A)\tilde{}$ as introduced in the proof of Lemma 4.2.1. Since it follows from that lemma that the image of $L(A)\tilde{}$ in $H^0(\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})$ (denoted simply by $L(A)$) does not depend on any choices, we are done.

(3) The modification that are done to transform an object in $H^0(C(\operatorname{Inj}(\mathcal{A}))^{f0}_{\mathrm{can}})$ into one in $H^0((\operatorname{Tw}\mathfrak{b})^f_{\mathrm{can}})$ are all represented by arrows in the kernel of G (since they have degree ≥ 1). Hence they disappear again if we apply the functor G. □

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We first prove that the functor L exists. Put $B_1 = \tau_{\leq 0}B$ and let B_2 be the pullback of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & R \\ & & \downarrow \\ B_1 & \twoheadrightarrow & H^0(B_1) \end{array}$$

Then $H^0(B_2) = R$ and $H^i(B_2) = 0$ for $i = -1, \ldots, -m$ and $i > 0$.

Let $\mathrm{Proj}(R)$ be the category of projective R-modules and let $\mathrm{Int}(B_2)$ be the category of cofibrant objects in $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(B_2)$ for the model structure for which the fibrations are the surjective maps. The DG-category $\mathrm{Int}(B_2)$ is a DG-enhancement for $D(B_2)$. In particular, $H^0(\mathrm{Int}(B_2))$ is Karoubian and we may define an additive functor

$$L : \mathrm{Proj}(R) \to H^0(\mathrm{Int}(B_2))$$

such that $L(R) = B_2$. Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the DG-category with objects $P \in \mathrm{Proj}(R)$, and Hom-complexes

$$\mathfrak{b}(L(P), L(Q)) = \tau_{\leq 0}\,\mathrm{Int}(B_2)(L(P), L(Q))$$

Then by the dual version of Theorem 4.1.1 we get an exact functor $D^b(R) \to H^0(\mathrm{Tw}\,\mathfrak{b}) \hookrightarrow D(B_2)$ sending R to B_2. Composing further with the functor $B \overset{L}{\otimes}_{B_2} -$ yields what we want.

So we have constructed an exact functor

$$L : D^b(R) \to D(B)$$

which sends R to B in a way that is compatible with the right R-action on both sides in $D(B)$. Assume now that L is of the form $U \overset{L}{\otimes}_R -$ for U an object in $D(B \otimes_k R^\circ)$. We assume that U represented by a cofibrant object in $\underline{\mathrm{Mod}}(B \otimes_k R^\circ)$ also denoted by U. Since by construction the isomorphism $U = L(R) \cong B$ is compatible with the right R-action on both sides in $D(B)$, it follows that B as an object in $D(B)_{R^\circ}$ lifts to an object in $D(B \otimes_k R^\circ)$. In other words, the obstructions $o_i(B)$ exhibited in §7.3 vanish, which by the proof of Lemma 7.3.1 is the same as saying that there is a B-linear right A_∞-R-action on B lifting the right R action on $H^*(B)$, i.e. there is a A_∞-morphism $R^\circ \to \mathrm{End}_B(B) = B^\circ$, finishing the proof.

Appendix C. Proof of Proposition 1.3

C.1. **The unital DG-hull of a strictly unital A_∞-category.** In this section we temporarily drop our blanket convention that A_∞-notions are automatically strictly unital.

If $\mathfrak{a}$ is a strictly unital A_∞-algebra then there exists a universal strictly unital A_∞ morphism $\psi_\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{a} \to U^u(\mathfrak{a})$ to a DG-algebra [24, p127].

Concretely, $U^u(\mathfrak{a})$ is a suitable quotient of the non-unital DG-hull $\Omega\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a}$ with identity morphisms adjoined. Taking the quotient is necessary to make the adjoined identity morphisms compatible with the ones in $\mathfrak{a}$. From this explicit description one shows easily that $\psi_\mathfrak{a}$ is a quasi-isomorphism and in particular one has equivalences of categories

$$D_\infty(\mathfrak{a}) \cong D_\infty(U^u(\mathfrak{a})) \cong D(U^u(\mathfrak{a}))$$

where on the right we have the usual derived category of a DG-algebra. The second equivalence is [24, Cor. 4.1.3.11].

Since $\Omega\mathbb{B}\mathfrak{a} = T^c(\Sigma^{-1}T(\Sigma\mathfrak{a}))$ (tensor (co)categories without (co)unit) we find that $U^u(\mathfrak{a})$ is concentrated in degrees ≤ 0.

C.2. **The proof.** By Theorem 1.2 we have to compute the obstruction against lifting the natural map $R \to H^*(R_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}})$. By construction, there is a A_∞-quasi-isomorphism $R_\eta \to R_\eta^{\mathrm{dg}}$. Hence, by Corollary 7.2.2, it is sufficient to compute the obstructions for lifting the natural map $f : R \to H^0(R_\eta)$. By Remark 7.2.5, the first possible non-vanishing obstruction is $o_n(f) = \eta$, and it is indeed non-vanishing since we have assumed $\eta \neq 0$. So lifting is not possible, finishing the proof.

References

[1] L. Alonso Tarrío, A. Jeremías López, and J. Lipman, *Local homology and cohomology on schemes*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **30** (1997), no. 1, 1–39.

[2] D. Arinkin and A. Caldararu, *When is the self-intersection of a subvariety a fibration?*, Adv. Math. **231** (2012), no. 2, 815–842.

[3] M. R. Ballard, *Equivalences of derived categories of sheaves on quasi-projective schemes*, arXiv:0905.3148 [math.AG].

[4] A.A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, and P. Deligne, *Faisceaux pervers*, Astérisque, vol. 100, Soc. Math. France, 1983.

[5] D. Benson, H. Krause, and S. Schwede, *Introduction to realizability of modules over Tate cohomology*, Representations of algebras and related topics, Fields Inst. Commun., vol. 45, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005, pp. 81–97.

[6] M. Böckstedt and A. Neeman, *Homotopy limits in triangulated categories*, Compositio Math. **86** (1993), 209–234.

[7] A. Bondal and M. Kapranov, *Representable functors, Serre functors, and reconstructions*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **53** (1989), no. 6, 1183–1205, 1337.

[8] ———, *Enhanced triangulated categories*, Math. USSR Sbornik **70** (1991), 93–107.

[9] A. Bondal and M. Van den Bergh, *Generators and representability of functors in commutative and noncommutative geometry*, Mosc. Math. J. **3** (2003), no. 1, 1–36, 258.

[10] A. I. Bondal, M. Larsen, and V. A. Lunts, *Grothendieck ring of pretriangulated categories*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2004), no. 29, 1461–1495. MR 2051435 (2005d:18014)

[11] A. Canonaco, D. Orlov, and P. Stellari, *Does full imply faithful?*, J. Noncommut. Geom. **7** (2013), no. 2, 357–371.

[12] A. Canonaco and P. Stellari, *Fourier-mukai functors in the supported case*, arXiv:1010.0798 [math.AG], to appear in Compositio Math.

[13] ———, *Twisted Fourier-Mukai functors*, Adv. Math. **212** (2007), no. 2, 484–503.

[14] ———, *Fourier-Mukai functors: a survey*, Derived categories in algebraic geometry, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2012, pp. 27–60.

[15] ———, *Non-uniqueness of Fourier-Mukai kernels*, Math. Z. **272** (2012), no. 1-2, 577–588.

[16] O. De Deken and W. Lowen, *On deformations of triangulated models*, Adv. Math. **243** (2013), 330–374.

[17] M. Gerstenhaber and S. D. Schack, *The cohomology of presheaves of algebras. I. Presheaves over a partially ordered set*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **310** (1988), no. 1, 135–165.

[18] R. Hartshorne, *Residues and duality*, Lecture notes in mathematics, vol. 20, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[19] ———, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 1977.

[20] M. M. Kapranov, *On the derived categories of coherent sheaves on some homogeneous spaces*, Invent. Math. **92** (1988), no. 3, 479–508.

[21] Y. Kawamata, *Equivalences of derived categories of sheaves on smooth stacks*, Amer. J. Math. **126** (2004), no. 5, 1057–1083.

[22] H. Knörrer, *Cohen-Macaulay modules on hypersurface singularities I*, Invent. Math. **116** (1985), 147–164.

[23] A. Kuznetsov, *Height of exceptional collections and Hochschild cohomology of quasiphantom categories*, arXiv:1211.4693 [math.AG].

[24] K. Lefèvre-Hasegawa, *Sur les A_∞-catégories*, Ph.D. thesis, Université Paris 7, 2003.
[25] J.-L. Loday, *Cyclic homology*, second ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 301, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998, Appendix E by María O. Ronco, Chapter 13 by the author in collaboration with Teimuraz Pirashvili.
[26] W. Lowen, *Hochschild cohomology, the characteristic morphism and derived deformations*, Compos. Math. **144** (2008), no. 6, 1557–1580.
[27] W. Lowen and M. Van den Bergh, in preparation.
[28] ———, *The curvature problem for formal and infinitesimal deformations*, arXiv:1505.03698 [math.KT].
[29] ———, *Hochschild cohomology of abelian categories and ringed spaces*, Adv. Math. **198** (2005), no. 1, 172–221.
[30] ———, *A Hochschild cohomology comparison theorem for prestacks*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 2, 969–986.
[31] V. A. Lunts and D. O. Orlov, *Uniqueness of enhancement for triangulated categories*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 3, 853–908.
[32] V. A. Lunts and O. M. Schnürer, *New enhancements of derived categories of coherent sheaves and applications*, arXiv:1406.7559 [math.AG].
[33] F. Muro, *On Massey products and triangulated categories*, http://personal.us.es/fmuro/dcw2.pdf.
[34] A. Neeman, *The connection between the K-theory localization theorem of Thomason, Trobaugh and Yao and the smashing subcategories of Bousfield and Ravenel*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **25** (1992), no. 5, 547–566.
[35] ———, *Stable homotopy as a triangulated functor*, Invent. Math. **109** (1992), no. 1, 17–40.
[36] ———, *The Grothendieck duality theorem via Bousfield's techniques and Brown representability*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), 205–236.
[37] ———, *Triangulated categories*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 148, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001.
[38] D. O. Orlov, *Equivalences of derived categories and $K3$ surfaces*, J. Math. Sci. (New York) **84** (1997), no. 5, 1361–1381, Algebraic geometry, 7.
[39] L. Positselski, *Weakly curved A-infinity algebras over a topological local ring*, arXiv:1202.2697 [math.CT].
[40] J. Rickard, *Morita theory for derived categories*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **39** (1989), 436–456.
[41] ———, *Derived equivalences as derived functors*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **43** (1991), no. 1, 37–48.
[42] A. Rizzardo, *On the existence of Fourier-Mukai kernels*, arXiv:1210.1419 [math.AG].
[43] ———, *Representability of cohomological functors over extension fields*, to appear in J. Noncomm. Geom, 2012.
[44] A. Rizzardo and M. Van den Bergh, *Scalar extensions of derived categories and non-fourier-mukai functors*, arXiv:1402.4506, to appear in Advances in Mathematics, 2014.
[45] R. G. Swan, *Hochschild cohomology of quasiprojective schemes*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **110** (1996), no. 1, 57–80.
[46] B. Toën, *The homotopy theory of dg-categories and derived Morita theory*, Invent. Math. **167** (2007), no. 3, 615–667.
[47] A. van de Ven, *A property of algebraic varieties in complex projective spaces*, Colloque Géom. Diff. Globale (Bruxelles, 1958), Centre Belge Rech. Math., Louvain, 1959, pp. 151–152. MR 0116361 (22 #7149)

E-mail address, Alice Rizzardo: alice.rizzardo@ed.ac.uk

School of Mathematics, The University of Edinburgh, James Clerk Maxwell Building, The King's Buildings, Peter Guthrie Tait Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3FD, Scotland, UK

E-mail address, Michel Van den Bergh: michel.vandenbergh@uhasselt.be

Universiteit Hasselt, Universitaire Campus, 3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium